TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The *National Era* is published every Thursday, on the following terms:

Single copy, one year $2.00
Three copies, one year 5.00
Five copies, one year 8.00
Ten copies, one year 15.00
Single copy, six months 1.00
Ten copies, six months 8.00

Voluntary agents are entitled to retain 50 cents commission on each yearly, and 25 cents commission on each semi-yearly, subscriber, *except in the case of Clubs.*

A Club of five subscribers, at $8, will entitle the person making it up to a copy for 6 months; a Club of ten, at $15, to a copy for one year. When a Club has been forwarded, additions may be made to it, on the same terms.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XI. WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1857. NO. 571.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Ten cents a line for the first insertion, *five* cents a line for each subsequent one. Ten words constitute a line. Payment in advance is invariably required.

☞ Money may be forwarded by mail, a *my risk.* Notes on Eastern banks preferred. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit.

☞ Subscribers wishing their papers changed, will give the name of the post office changed *from*, as well as the post office they wish it hereafter sent *to*.

☞ All communications to the *Era*, whether on business of the paper or for publication, should be addressed to

G. BAILEY, *Washington, D. C.*

WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the National Era.

ON THE SIDEWALK.

BY GAIL HAMILTON.

"None but thou and I shall know
Whose the doom and whose the woe—
None but thou and I shall share
In the secret printed here—
It shall be a secret still,
Though all look on it at will.
And the eye shall read in vain,
What the heart cannot explain."

On the sidewalk, night and morning,
Ceaseless tread of eager feet—
Pleasure, passion, pain, and madness,
Sluicking up and down the street.
How the golden stars were burning,
Throbbing, glowing, in the sky;
How the earth lay calm and holy,
Underneath the summer sky,
As we walked among the walkers—
Slowly, sadly—you and I.

But the stars serene and shining,
And the moonlight, always cold,
And the countless crowds, pursuing
Wisdom, glory, wine, or gold—
Drew no meaning, read no token,
Felt no mighty, mystic power,
From the words we lightly uttered,
In that unforgotten hour—
Lightly spoken, lightly spoken—
Woe is me, the heavy heart!
Woe is me, the dreary phantom
That may never more depart.
O the sudden, silent anguish,
Drinking up the springs of life!
O the terrible concealing
Outward sign of inward strife!
Bootless, fruitless, vain outreaching
For the light too early gone.
Shadowy moments of the past,
Only, left to live upon.

You will go your way in life,
I shall calmly walk in mine.
Of that hour of strange communing
All my years shall give no sign.
While I wander in the darkness,
Be the way or short or long,
All the guards of my heart's portals
Shall be sunshine, smiles, and song.
Fear you not, I have a balsam
For the burning in my brain;
This is joy beyond all sorrow—
We are one—by common pain.
Did you feel my heart was breaking?
Did I read your soul aright?
Did we know it was forever?
But we only said "Good night!"

Life is short, and Love eternal.
This the golden garland be
For the bitter, brimming chalice
Poured alike to you and me.
Bravely gird thy robes about thee,
Bravely take thy staff in hand,
Bravely onward, onward, upward,
To the undiscovered land.
Heave no sigh in vain regretting
For the days that might have been;
This should be thy soul's amazing,
He must run who wills to win.
When the sun of life spheres westward,
And the lengthening shadows fall,
Looking back on all our pathway,
We will bless the Lord for all.

For the National Era.

CENUINENESS OF THE WAVERLEY NOVELS.

Epidemics mental are no rarer things than epidemics physical. The present influenza among the *genus Bohemianum* has taken the form of plagiary-hunting, and its most deplorably-pitiable exhibition is the pamphlet which has lately gone through two editions in England, entitled, "Who wrote the Earlier Waverley Novels," and accredited to one Mr. Fitzpatrick. If there is anything more repulsive than a rat, it is a weasel; if any character is more despicable than a thief, it is the informer. But when the informer is a Titus Oates, a Lilubs, a Martha Parris, whose only chance for notoriety is to cry ghost, witch, papist, at a windshaken shirt or a harmless old woman, it seems to us almost criminal to take other notice of him than to recommend him to a beam and a halter; and certainly we should never have taken up a pen to speak of the slipper of this new Empedocles, had not the "London Critic" and Mr. Gilfillan been so imprudent as to countenance his miserable book.

Gilfillan, who is editing a new edition of Sir Walter Scott's Works, has replied to Mr. Fitzpatrick in a tone that in no means either creditable to his sagacity or just to the subject, much less to the character of his great compatriot. We do not propose to reopen a discussion that was definitively settled long before Scott publicly avowed his authorship, by the very able and ingenious "Letters to Heber," published by Mr. Adolphus, in 1821. If any persons fancy the authorship of the Waverley Novels at all questionable, we refer them to this complete and exhaustive analysis of the subject, in which the young author has demonstrated, as completely as moral reasoning can demonstrate anything, that no other individual than Walter Scott, sheriff, advocate in Edinburgh, editor of the Border Ballads, and author of Marmion, *could* have written the Waverley Novels. Mr. Gilfillan might have spared himself further trouble than that of quoting, as Lockhart has done, the table of contents simply of Mr. Adolphus's book; and the mere catalouging of the points established would have recalled to every reader of Scott an internal evidence to their genuineness, so powerful that no statement of extraneous circumstances, however plausible, could have availed to shake it.

We shall not say anything of Mr. Fitzpatrick's pamphlet, further than to point out several instances of error so glaring as to prove either that he has never read Lockhart's admirable biography, or (which is more probable) that he has been guilty of wilful falsehood, for the sake of making out his case.

He says, in one place, "Mr. Lockhart admits, that on December 25th, 1814, no part of 'Guy Mannering' had been written by Walter Scott; yet, on the 18th of January, 1815, two volumes of that novel were printed. What! two volumes of 'Guy Mannering' composed, written, copied, printed, and proof corrected, in twenty three days! Yet Mr. Lockhart, in another part of his memoirs, states that Scott, at the height of his powers, occupied fifteen pages of print to be a good day's work; and he should think it was. Even this is an exaggeration, *for Scott himself noted in his diary the accomplishment of ten or twelve pages as a good day's work.*" Now, in this style do they pick a man's reputation to pieces! Any uninformed person reading the above would say, with the "London Critic," "There must be something in this." So there would be, only these statements labor under the slight disadvantage of being false from beginning to end. In the first place, Lockhart intends no such idea as he is credited with above; and as for *confessing it*, when "Guy Mannering" was written, he knew as little about the authorship of the Waverley Novels as Mr. Fitzpatrick does about their genuineness. Lockhart says this: "It has been shown that the three last cantos of the Lord of the Isles were written between 11th of November and 25th of December, and it is therefore scarcely supposable that any of this novel had been penned before he thus talked of 'refreshing the machine.' It is quite certain, that when James Ballantyne wrote to Miss Edgeworth, on the 11th of November, he could not have seen one page of 'Guy Mannering,' since he in that letter announces that the new novel of his nameless friend would depict manners more ancient than those of 1745." Now, it is equally certain that on the 7th of November, Scott received from Mr. Train the ballad upon which Guy Mannering is founded; and it is not improbable that he began the new novel forthwith, else why would Ballantyne have written of his "friend's new novel" *at all*, only four days after the material was received? Any one might read the first sheet or two of Guy Mannering, and say, with reason, that it treated of manners "more ancient" than 1745. There is no reason for saying that Scott did not take up 'Guy Mannering" before he had finished the "Lord of the Isles." He wrote the "Bridal of Triermain" while engaged upon another of his novels; and it was always a favorite custom of his to keep several "irons in the fire" at once. We must always remember, that this passage in Lockhart partakes of the character of "special pleading." He was instancing the rapidity with which Scott wrote; and is there any wonder, if, in his desire to make out as strong a case as possible, he overshot his mark?

But even granting, for the sake of the argument, that the two first volumes of "Guy Mannering" must have been written between December 25th and January 18th, if we are to believe it the composition of Walter Scott, we cannot see that it was so remarkable a circumstance as Mr. Fitzpatrick wishes us to regard it. It is well known that Scott sent his manuscript to press as fast as it left his hands, and was copied, day by day; and there is nothing absurd in supposing that a house like that of Ballantyne & Co. could print as fast as one man could write. As far as the *copying* part is concerned, hear what Basil Hall says: "Any clerk in an office could transcribe one of the Waverley novels in a week or ten days—say a fortnight." Hence the question reduces down to this one: How fast *could* and *did* Scott write? Mr. Fitzpatrick states, giving Lockhart as authority, that Scott, in the height of his powers, could write fifteen printed pages a day. Now, this is false, and, we fear, wilfully so; and to prove it, we refer the reader to Scott's Diary, *passim*. For instance: "December 26, 1825.—I wrote six of my close pages yesterday, which is about *twenty-four pages in print*; and what is more, I think it comes off twangingly." "January 23, 1826.—Wrote till 12 M., finishing *half of* what I call a *good day's work*—ten pages of print, or rather twelve." This is the passage Mr. Fitzpatrick refers to above, and we see that he has divided the fact by two, which makes a material difference in the result. "January 30th.—Proceed fairly yesterday. The stream rose fast—if clearly, is another question; but there is bulk for it, at least—*about thirty printed pages.*" "February 3d.—" From the 19th of January to the 2d of February, including, as I exactly fifteen days, during which time, *with the intermission of some days idleness*, to let imagination brood on the task a little, *I have written a volume.* I think, for a bet, I could have done it in *ten days*." "January 30th.—I have won this bet, for, under date of February 12th, we find the following entry: "Having ended the second volume of Woodstock last night, I had to begin the third this morning." Again: "February 20th.—Yesterday, though late in beginning, I nearly finished *my task*, which is six of my close pages, *about thirty pages of print.*" "March 12th.—Resumed Woodstock, and wrote *my task of six pages.*" &c.

Now, we find Mr. Walter, at this time, taking himself to write these twenty-four to thirty pages a day—not fifteen, Mr. Fitzpatrick!—and actually completing two volumes in less than twenty five days, "with the intermission of some days idleness;" and at the very time, he was in his fifty-fifth year, broken in health, suffering from the actual presence of acute disease, and in a state of the most terrible mental affliction and despondency, on account of the calamity which, only a few years previous, had involved his fortune, and, as he feared, his good name. Will Mr. Fitzpatrick assert that he was not capable of doing so much in 1815, when he was in the prime of life, in the enjoyment of the most perfect health and spirits, and in a perfect fever of literary activity? Besides, while writing Woodstock, he had to give, on an average, four hours of his time daily to the Court, which was then in session in Edinburgh; and this was the only attendance was required by his duties as sheriff; when he wrote "Guy Mannering," he was away from his family, and without company, at Abbotsford, "refreshing the machine," as he styled it. Now, we do not think that any one could while composing "Guy Mannering," we learn from his letter to J. B. S. Merritt, dated 19th January, 1815, in which he writes, "I want to shake myself free from Waverley, [i. e. to free himself from the suspicion of being the author,] and accordingly *have made a considerable exertion to finish an odd little tale within such time as will multiply the public.* I trust, unless my puppose may be disbarred, I shall certainly, Sir Walter *did* succeed in "mystifying" Mr. Fitzpatrick.

But enough of this. If Mr. Fitzpatrick's blunders are from ignorance, it is the public's fault, for not taking him into the secret; if his mistakes are wilful, we can but pity the man who, for the sake of seeing himself in print, attempts to sully the fair fame of such a man as Walter Scott. We blame Mr. Gilfillan for publishing in which he has replied to this nonsensical pamphlet. No one who is at all acquainted with the character of Walter Scott, no one who has read his letters, his diary, his books, will dare to credit such a defamation of his character; and we will venture to say we find a more genial, honest, true-hearted gentleman. Call over the bede-roll of literary history, Shakspeare, Sydney, Spenser, Jean Paul, Rousseau, Johnson, can you name any one of them who would have been capable of such a base act? Scott, as his creditors, to pay off a debt with which he was hampered by the criminality of others, and which, legally considered, there was no obligation upon him to pay? Call to mind the noble sentiment any man he named, of all the famous ones, who more scrupulously and entirely and explicitly stated, and gave chapter and verse for every word, thought, idea, which he borrowed from others? And yet this man, honest, high-hearted man of honor, this noble, indefatigable worker, is vilely and without reason accused of having stolen his best work from his own brother!

Is there no remedy for this? Is the "good old times," when a man defamed another, the custom was to crop his ears, fix him in the pillory, and pelt him with foul eggs, until he came to his right senses. Where is the pillory for Fitzpatrick? Alas! the sentence will not do for he is so far beneath it, that its indignant waves would not disturb him.

But, seriously, there ought to be some remedy against this mania for accusations of plagiarism. It is very well enough to say that books are "public men," and must look for and submit to such things. So are the Capitol and the Congressional Library public property; but is a man therefore exempt from punishment, if he be detected in the act of stealing or destroying the statuary? To accuse an author of having plagiarized, is as much defamation of character as to accuse one's neighbor of having picked your pocket; and the same protection should be extended in the one case that is availed of in the other.

For our own part, we wish Mr. Fitzpatrick no greater punishment, no more profound humiliation, than that of being compelled to give a public reading of his book, and the mortification of being false from beginning to end. In the first place, Lockhart intends no such idea as he is credited with above; and as for *confessing it*, when "Guy Mannering" was written, he knew as little about the authorship of the Waverley Novels as Mr. Fitzpatrick does about their genuineness. Lockhart says this: "It has been shown that the three last cantos of the Lord of the Isles were written between 11th of November and 25th of December, and it is therefore scarcely supposable that any of this novel had been penned before he thus talked of 'refreshing the machine.' It is quite certain, that when James Ballantyne wrote to Miss Edgeworth, on the 11th of November, he could not have seen one page of 'Guy Mannering,' since he in that letter announces that the new novel of his nameless friend would depict man-

BELOOCHEE TRAITS;
OR,
ADVENTURES IN BELOOCHISTAN.

In the last number of *Blackwood* there is an interesting article on Beloochistan, by one who has travelled much in Central Asia, from which we extract the following:

A BELOOCHEE DOCTOR.

To the practice of medicine in Beloochistan there are only two slight drawbacks. When the physician gives a dose, he is expected to partake of a similar one himself, as a guarantee of his good faith; should the patient die under his hands, the relatives, though hyno meanshound to exercise it in all manner of circumstances, have the right of putting him to death, unless a special agreement has been made, freeing him from all responsibility as to the consequences; while he, should they decide on immolating him, has no reasonable ground for complaint, but is expected to submit to his fate like a man and a hakim.

But even granting, for the sake of the argument, that the two first volumes of "Guy Mannering" must have been written between December 25th and January 18th, if we are to believe it the composition of Walter Scott, we cannot see that it was so remarkable a circumstance as Mr. Fitzpatrick wishes us to regard it. It is well known that Scott sent his manuscript to press as fast as it left his hands, and was copied, day by day; and there is nothing absurd in supposing that a house like that of Ballantyne & Co. could print as fast as one man could write. As far as the *copying* part is concerned, hear what Basil Hall says: "Any clerk in an office could transcribe one of the Waverley novels in a week or ten days—say a fortnight." Hence the question reduces down to this one: How fast *could* and *did* Scott write? Mr. Fitzpatrick states, giving Lockhart as authority, that Scott, in the height of his powers, could write fifteen printed pages a day. Now, this is false, and, we fear, wilfully so; and to prove it, we refer the reader to Scott's Diary, *passim*. For instance: "December 26, 1825.—I wrote six of my close pages yesterday, which is about *twenty-four pages in print*; and what is more, I think it comes off twangingly." "January 23, 1826.—Wrote till 12 M., finishing *half of* what I call a *good day's work*—ten pages of print, or rather twelve." This is the passage Mr. Fitzpatrick refers to above, and we see that he has divided the fact by two, which makes a material difference in the result. "January 30th.—Proceed fairly yesterday. The stream rose fast—if clearly, is another question; but there is bulk for it, at least—*about thirty printed pages.*" "February 3d.—" From the 19th of January to the 2d of February, including, as I exactly fifteen days, during which time, *with the intermission of some days idleness*, to let imagination brood on the task a little, *I have written a volume.* I think, for a bet, I could have done it in *ten days*." "January 30th.—I have won this bet, for, under date of February 12th, we find the following entry: "Having ended the second volume of Woodstock last night, I had to begin the third this morning." Again: "February 20th.—Yesterday, though late in beginning, I nearly finished *my task*, which is six of my close pages, *about thirty pages of print.*" "March 12th.—Resumed Woodstock, and wrote *my task of six pages.*" &c.

Now, we find Mr. Walter, at this time, taking himself to write these twenty-four to thirty pages a day—not fifteen, Mr. Fitzpatrick!—and actually completing two volumes in less than twenty five days, "with the intermission of some days idleness;" and at the very time, he was in his fifty-fifth year, broken in health, suffering from the actual presence of acute disease, and in a state of the most terrible mental affliction and despondency, on account of the calamity which, only a few years previous, had involved his fortune, and, as he feared, his good name. Will Mr. Fitzpatrick assert that he was not capable of doing so much in 1815, when he was in the prime of life, in the enjoyment of the most perfect health and spirits, and in a perfect fever of literary activity? Besides, while writing Woodstock, he had to give, on an average, four hours of his time daily to the Court, which was then in session in Edinburgh; and this was the only attendance was required by his duties as sheriff; when he wrote "Guy Mannering," he was away from his family, and without company, at Abbotsford, "refreshing the machine," as he styled it. Now, we do not think that any one could while composing "Guy Mannering," we learn from his letter to J. B. S. Merritt, dated 19th January, 1815, in which he writes, "I want to shake myself free from Waverley, [i. e. to free himself from the suspicion of being the author,] and accordingly *have made a considerable exertion to finish an odd little tale within such time as will multiply the public.* I trust, unless my puppose may be disbarred, I shall certainly, Sir Walter *did* succeed in "mystifying" Mr. Fitzpatrick.

But enough of this. If Mr. Fitzpatrick's blunders are from ignorance, it is the public's fault, for not taking him into the secret; if his mistakes are wilful, we can but pity the man who, for the sake of seeing himself in print, attempts to sully the fair fame of such a man as Walter Scott. We blame Mr. Gilfillan for publishing in which he has replied to this nonsensical pamphlet. No one who is at all acquainted with the character of Walter Scott, no one who has read his letters, his diary, his books, will dare to credit such a defamation of his character; and we will venture to say we find a more genial, honest, true-hearted gentleman. Call over the bede-roll of literary history, Shakspeare, Sydney, Spenser, Jean Paul, Rousseau, Johnson, can you name any one of them who would have been capable of such a base act? Scott, as his creditors, to pay off a debt with which he was hampered by the criminality of others, and which, legally considered, there was no obligation upon him to pay? Call to mind the noble sentiment any man he named, of all the famous ones, who more scrupulously and entirely and explicitly stated, and gave chapter and verse for every word, thought, idea, which he borrowed from others? And yet this man, honest, high-hearted man of honor, this noble, indefatigable worker, is vilely and without reason accused of having stolen his best work from his own brother!

Is there no remedy for this? Is the "good old times," when a man defamed another, the custom was to crop his ears, fix him in the pillory, and pelt him with foul eggs, until he came to his right senses. Where is the pillory for Fitzpatrick? Alas! the sentence will not do for he is so far beneath it, that its indignant waves would not disturb him.

But, seriously, there ought to be some remedy against this mania for accusations of plagiarism. It is very well enough to say that books are "public men," and must look for and submit to such things. So are the Capitol and the Congressional Library public property; but is a man therefore exempt from punishment, if he be detected in the act of stealing or destroying the statuary? To accuse an author of having plagiarized, is as much defamation of character as to accuse one's neighbor of having picked your pocket; and the same protection should be extended in the one case that is availed of in the other.

For our own part, we wish Mr. Fitzpatrick no greater punishment, no more profound humiliation, than that of being compelled to give a public reading of his book, and the mortification of being false from beginning to end. In the first place, Lockhart intends no such idea as he is credited with above; and as for *confessing it*, when "Guy Mannering" was written, he knew as little about the authorship of the Waverley Novels as Mr. Fitzpatrick does about their genuineness. Lockhart says this: "It has been shown that the three last cantos of the Lord of the Isles were written between 11th of November and 25th of December, and it is therefore scarcely supposable that any of this novel had been penned before he thus talked of 'refreshing the machine.' It is quite certain, that when James Ballantyne wrote to Miss Edgeworth, on the 11th of November, he could not have seen one page of 'Guy Mannering,' since he in that letter announces that the new novel of his nameless friend would depict man-

A MODEST REQUEST.—In the Tennessee Senate, Mr. Goodpasture presented a memorial from citizens of Scott county, asking to be released from taxation, on account of the hard times, and that an appropriation of $4,000 or $5,000 be made for their benefit.

ners more ancient than those of 1745." Now, it is equally certain that on the 7th of November, Scott received from Mr. Train the ballad upon which Guy Mannering is founded; and it is not improbable that he began the new novel forthwith, else why would Ballantyne have written of his "friend's new novel" *at all*, only four days after the material was received? Any one might read the first sheet or two of Guy Mannering, and say, with reason, that it treated of manners "more ancient" than 1745. There is no reason for saying that Scott did not take up 'Guy Mannering" before he had finished the "Lord of the Isles." He wrote the "Bridal of Triermain" while engaged upon another of his novels; and it was always a favorite custom of his to keep several "irons in the fire" at once. We must always remember, that this passage in Lockhart partakes of the character of "special pleading." He was instancing the rapidity with which Scott wrote; and is there any wonder, if, in his desire to make out as strong a case as possible, he overshot his mark?

But even granting, for the sake of the argument, that the two first volumes of "Guy Mannering" must have been written between December 25th and January 18th, if we are to believe it the composition of Walter Scott, we cannot see that it was so remarkable a circumstance as Mr. Fitzpatrick wishes us to regard it. It is well known that Scott sent his manuscript to press as fast as it left his hands, and was copied, day by day; and there is nothing absurd in supposing that a house like that of Ballantyne & Co. could print as fast as one man could write. As far as the *copying* part is concerned, hear what Basil Hall says: "Any clerk in an office could transcribe one of the Waverley novels in a week or ten days—say a fortnight." Hence the question reduces down to this one: How fast *could* and *did* Scott write? Mr. Fitzpatrick states, giving Lockhart as authority, that Scott, in the height of his powers, could write fifteen printed pages a day. Now, this is false, and, we fear, wilfully so; and to prove it, we refer the reader to Scott's Diary, *passim*. For instance: "December 26, 1825.—I wrote six of my close pages yesterday, which is about *twenty-four pages in print*; and what is more, I think it comes off twangingly." "January 23, 1826.—Wrote till 12 M., finishing *half of* what I call a *good day's work*—ten pages of print, or rather twelve." This is the passage Mr. Fitzpatrick refers to above, and we see that he has divided the fact by two, which makes a material difference in the result. "January 30th.—Proceed fairly yesterday. The stream rose fast—if clearly, is another question; but there is bulk for it, at least—*about thirty printed pages.*" "February 3d.—" From the 19th of January to the 2d of February, including, as I exactly fifteen days, during which time, *with the intermission of some days idleness*, to let imagination brood on the task a little, *I have written a volume.* I think, for a bet, I could have done it in *ten days*." "January 30th.—I have won this bet, for, under date of February 12th, we find the following entry: "Having ended the second volume of Woodstock last night, I had to begin the third this morning." Again: "February 20th.—Yesterday, though late in beginning, I nearly finished *my task*, which is six of my close pages, *about thirty pages of print.*" "March 12th.—Resumed Woodstock, and wrote *my task of six pages.*" &c.

Now, we find Mr. Walter, at this time, taking himself to write these twenty-four to thirty pages a day—not fifteen, Mr. Fitzpatrick!—and actually completing two volumes in less than twenty five days, "with the intermission of some days idleness;" and at the very time, he was in his fifty-fifth year, broken in health, suffering from the actual presence of acute disease, and in a state of the most terrible mental affliction and despondency, on account of the calamity which, only a few years previous, had involved his fortune, and, as he feared, his good name. Will Mr. Fitzpatrick assert that he was not capable of doing so much in 1815, when he was in the prime of life, in the enjoyment of the most perfect health and spirits, and in a perfect fever of literary activity? Besides, while writing Woodstock, he had to give, on an average, four hours of his time daily to the Court, which was then in session in Edinburgh; and this was the only attendance was required by his duties as sheriff; when he wrote "Guy Mannering," he was away from his family, and without company, at Abbotsford, "refreshing the machine," as he styled it. Now, we do not think that any one could while composing "Guy Mannering," we learn from his letter to J. B. S. Merritt, dated 19th January, 1815, in which he writes, "I want to shake myself free from Waverley, [i. e. to free himself from the suspicion of being the author,] and accordingly *have made a considerable exertion to finish an odd little tale within such time as will multiply the public.* I trust, unless my puppose may be disbarred, I shall certainly, Sir Walter *did* succeed in "mystifying" Mr. Fitzpatrick.

But enough of this. If Mr. Fitzpatrick's blunders are from ignorance, it is the public's fault, for not taking him into the secret; if his mistakes are wilful, we can but pity the man who, for the sake of seeing himself in print, attempts to sully the fair fame of such a man as Walter Scott. We blame Mr. Gilfillan for publishing in which he has replied to this nonsensical pamphlet. No one who is at all acquainted with the character of Walter Scott, no one who has read his letters, his diary, his books, will dare to credit such a defamation of his character; and we will venture to say we find a more genial, honest, true-hearted gentleman. Call over the bede-roll of literary history, Shakspeare, Sydney, Spenser, Jean Paul, Rousseau, Johnson, can you name any one of them who would have been capable of such a base act? Scott, as his creditors, to pay off a debt with which he was hampered by the criminality of others, and which, legally considered, there was no obligation upon him to pay? Call to mind the noble sentiment any man he named, of all the famous ones, who more scrupulously and entirely and explicitly stated, and gave chapter and verse for every word, thought, idea, which he borrowed from others? And yet this man, honest, high-hearted man of honor, this noble, indefatigable worker, is vilely and without reason accused of having stolen his best work from his own brother!

Is there no remedy for this? Is the "good old times," when a man defamed another, the custom was to crop his ears, fix him in the pillory, and pelt him with foul eggs, until he came to his right senses. Where is the pillory for Fitzpatrick? Alas! the sentence will not do for he is so far beneath it, that its indignant waves would not disturb him.

But, seriously, there ought to be some remedy against this mania for accusations of plagiarism. It is very well enough to say that books are "public men," and must look for and submit to such things. So are the Capitol and the Congressional Library public property; but is a man therefore exempt from punishment, if he be detected in the act of stealing or destroying the statuary? To accuse an author of having plagiarized, is as much defamation of character as to accuse one's neighbor of having picked your pocket; and the same protection should be extended in the one case that is availed of in the other.

For our own part, we wish Mr. Fitzpatrick no greater punishment, no more profound humiliation, than that of being compelled to give a public reading of his book, and the mortification of being false from beginning to end. In the first place, Lockhart intends no such idea as he is credited with above; and as for *confessing it*, when "Guy Mannering" was written, he knew as little about the authorship of the Waverley Novels as Mr. Fitzpatrick does about their genuineness. Lockhart says this: "It has been shown that the three last cantos of the Lord of the Isles were written between 11th of November and 25th of December, and it is therefore scarcely supposable that any of this novel had been penned before he thus talked of 'refreshing the machine.' It is quite certain, that when James Ballantyne wrote to Miss Edgeworth, on the 11th of November, he could not have seen one page of 'Guy Mannering,' since he in that letter announces that the new novel of his nameless friend would depict man-

EDWARD SPENCER.

Martin's Neat, Md., Nov., 1857.

PUNS AND PUNNING.

BY O. W. HOLMES.

Do you mean to say that the pun question is not clearly settled in your minds? Let me lay down the law upon the subject. Life and language are alike sacred. Homicide and *verbicide*—that is, violent treatment of word with fatal results to its legitimate meaning, which is its life—are alike forbidden. Manslaughter, which is the meaning of the one, is the same as man's laughter, which is the end of the other. A pun is *prima facie* an insult to the person you are talking with. It implies utter indifference to or sublime contempt for his remarks, no matter how serious. I speak of total depravity, and one says all that is written on the subject is deep raving. I have committed my self-respect by talking with such a person. I should like to commit him, but cannot, because he is a nuisance. Or I speak of geological convulsions, and he asks me what was the cosine of Noah's ark; also, whether the Deluge was not a great deal longer than any modern inundation.

A pun does not commonly justify a blow in return. But if a blow were given for such cause, and death ensued, the jury would be judges both of the facts and of the pun, and might, if the latter were of a highly malignant character, return the verdict of justifiable homicide. Thus, in a case lately decided before Miller, J., Doe presented Roe a subscription paper, and urged the claims of suffering humanity. Roe replied by asking, When charity was like a top? It was in evidence that Doe preserved a dignified silence. Roe then said, "When it begins to hum." Doe then—and not till then—struck Roe, and his head happening to strike a bound volume of the Monthly Rag-Bag and Stolen Miscellany, intense mortification ensued, with a fatal result. The chief laid down his notions of the law to his brother justices, who unanimously replied, "Just so." The chief rejoined, that no man should jest so without being punished for it, and charged for the prisoner, who was acquitted, and the pun ordered to be hurried by the sheriff. The hound volume was forfeited as a deodand, but not claimed.

People who make puns are like unclean boys that put coppers on the railroad tracks. They amuse themselves and other children, but their little trick may upset a freight train of conversation for the sake of a battered witticism.

I wish to refer to two eminent authorities. Now, be so good as to listen. The great moralist says, "To trifle with the vocabulary which is the vehicle of social intercourse, is to tamper with the currency of human intelligence. He who would violate the sanctities of his mother tongue, would invade the recesses of the paternal till without remorse, and repeat the banquet of Saturn without an indigestion."

And, once more, listen to the historian:

"The Puritans hated puns. The Bishops were notoriously addicted to them. The Lords Temporal carried them to the verge of license. Majesty itself must have its Royal quibble. 'Ye are hardy, my Lord of Buckingham,' said Queen Elizabeth, 'but ye shall make less stir in our realm than my Lord of Leicester.' The gravest wisdom and the highest breeding lent their sanction to the practice. Lord Bacon playfully declared himself a descendant of 'Og, the King of Bashan. Sir Philip Sidney, with his last breath, reproached the soldier who brought him water, for wasting a casque full upon a dying man. A courtier, who saw Othello performed at the Globe Theatre, remarked that the blackamoore was a brute, and not a man. 'Those,' replied a great Lord, 'according to Plato his saying; for this be a two-legged animal *with* feathers.' The fatal habit became universal. The language was corrupted. The infection spread to the national conscience. Political double-dealings naturally grew out of verbal double-meanings. The teeth of the new dragon were sown by the Cadmus who introduced the alphabet of equivocation. What was levity in the time of the Tudors, grew to regicide and revolution in the age of the Stuarts."

Who was that hoarder who just whispered something about the Macaulay-flowers of literature? There was a deaf silence. Then, calmly, I shall henceforth consider any interruption by a pun as a hint to change my boarding house. Do not plead my example. If *I* have used any such, it has been only as a Spartan father would show up a drunken Helot. We have done with them.—*Atlantic Monthly.*

WIFE KILLING.

Even in Sind, where the crime is punished with death, it is difficult to persuade the Beloochees that they have any right to slay their wives. One whom I saw executed for having done so, persisted to the last—even after he had a taste of the gallows, for on the first reversal of the drop, the rope broke, and he fell to the ground—in exclaiming against the cowardice, chloroform, galvanism, and a little jugglery, are the means by which the science of medical reputation could be procured and sustained. A galvanic shock might be set down as the explosion of a very powerful devil out of the Arabian Nights; but such principle might be supposed, when the patient was in a comatose state, to have visited the abodes of the blessed, and obtained a new lease of earthly life.

NOT AFRAID TO SMELL BLOOD.

With the wounds of the Beloochees I would have nothing to do, in which, as they are to hardships and constant accidents, the simplest treatment suffices. In cases of mutilation, they plunge the stump into boiling oil, and suffer less than Europeans would do from the hideous pain. Even when the limb is accidentally done, but in two cases came upon Brahuis who had just undergone the operation. The first of these was among the mountains to the north-west of Las, among the passes of which I was lost, and, wandering about, I came by the way to the plain below, where my tent was pitched. About midnight, while wandering about unable to sleep, from the cold, I got sight of some camp fires, and, advancing to them, narrowly escaped being shot by a party of the alarmed Brahuis. Luckily, however, they were aware of an amiable stranger being in their neighborhood, and, after the first alarm, received me gladly, increasing the fires, giving milk, and all sitting up to talk and smoke. One of these men showed me his hand, from which a camel had torn two fingers a little after dark that night, and which he had soothed with boiling oil, and then, with a hot iron, cauterized to prevent mortification. A thin cloth adhered to it, and over this was tied a piece of lamb's skin. The hand was a frightful ruin, but he took the matter very quietly, smoking, talking, and laughing with the rest, as if nothing particular had happened. The Brahuis, it must be remembered, are of Tartar race, and of all men the Tartars are the most insensible to pain, and consequently the most frequent and ingenious in it. I am well enough to be a judge of the highly-nervous and sensitive European who, as a foe, falls into their hands, to be slowly flayed alive, like General Bekevitch, or, as a slave, to be tortured during years. This insensibility to bodily suffering is one it was lucky that I understood his ridicule; for while the servant with me was explaining, there was time to consider how it should be met. The expedient I adopted was to pull out a knife, catch it by the point, and make a slight incision, intimating that there was nothing easier than to turn him white, only, in the first place, he would have to submit to being flayed. This rude but not very brilliant jest took amazingly, and passed off critical. Subsequent to this explanations seemed highly tickled and delighted at the idea of their friend losing his skin, and threw themselves on the ground, rolling about, laughing, and repeating, "Hakullo wants to be made white!" Hakullo, however, they stayed: Marsyas himself seemed paralyzed at the audacity of the proposal, and turned away growling precisely as a savage dog does from an untried foe which it is doubtful about attacking. This did not please his friends at all, and they were so earnest on the subject, that I began to fear—the more so, as he seemed an unpopular character among them—that they might tie him up, and insist on the operation being performed. After this I established himself behind a bush close by, and consoled myself with examining and handling his matchlock in a way which showed how his thoughts were running; for he aimed at me with it more than once, when he thought I was not observing. The cord not being lighted, there was no danger in this; but when he rose, lighted a large pipe, and took it over to his lair, I thought it expedient to speak to his affectionate friends on the subject, whereon there arose a bad man, and took his gun away from him. There was no great chances of the laws of hospitality being broken; but the possibility of the ruffian wreaking his vengeance on the unoffending wife afforded an unpleasant subject for reflection. That is to say, when Hakullo had a demoniac-looking mother-in-law, who seemed quite able to protect herself and her daughter too.

WIFE KILLING.

Even in Sind, where the crime is punished with death, it is difficult to persuade the Beloochees that they have any right to slay their wives. One whom I saw executed for having done so, persisted to the last—even after he had a taste of the gallows, for on the first reversal of the drop, the rope broke, and he fell to the ground—in exclaiming against the cowardice, chloroform, galvanism, and a little jugglery, are the means by which the science of medical reputation could be procured and sustained. A galvanic shock might be set down as the explosion of a very powerful devil out of the Arabian Nights; but such principle might be supposed, when the patient was in a comatose state, to have visited the abodes of the blessed, and obtained a new lease of earthly life.

NOT AFRAID TO SMELL BLOOD.

With the wounds of the Beloochees I would have nothing to do, in which, as they are to hardships and constant accidents, the simplest treatment suffices. In cases of mutilation, they plunge the stump into boiling oil, and suffer less than Europeans would do from the hideous pain. Even when the limb is accidentally done, but in two cases came upon Brahuis who had just undergone the operation. The first of these was among the mountains to the north-west of Las, among the passes of which I was lost, and, wandering about, I came by the way to the plain below, where my tent was pitched. About midnight, while wandering about unable to sleep, from the cold, I got sight of some camp fires, and, advancing to them, narrowly escaped being shot by a party of the alarmed Brahuis. Luckily, however, they were aware of an amiable stranger being in their neighborhood, and, after the first alarm, received me gladly, increasing the fires, giving milk, and all sitting up to talk and smoke. One of these men showed me his hand, from which a camel had torn two fingers a little after dark that night, and which he had soothed with boiling oil, and then, with a hot iron, cauterized to prevent mortification. A thin cloth adhered to it, and over this was tied a piece of lamb's skin. The hand was a frightful ruin, but he took the matter very quietly, smoking, talking, and laughing with the rest, as if nothing particular had happened. The Brahuis, it must be remembered, are of Tartar race, and of all men the Tartars are the most insensible to pain, and consequently the most frequent and ingenious in it. I am well enough to be a judge of the highly-nervous and sensitive European who, as a foe, falls into their hands, to be slowly flayed alive, like General Bekevitch, or, as a slave, to be tortured during years. This insensibility to bodily suffering is one it was lucky that I understood his ridicule; for while the servant with me was explaining, there was time to consider how it should be met. The expedient I adopted was to pull out a knife, catch it by the point, and make a slight incision, intimating that there was nothing easier than to turn him white, only, in the first place, he would have to submit to being flayed. This rude but not very brilliant jest took amazingly, and passed off critical. Subsequent to this explanations seemed highly tickled and delighted at the idea of their friend losing his skin, and threw themselves on the ground, rolling about, laughing, and repeating, "Hakullo wants to be made white!" Hakullo, however, they stayed: Marsyas himself seemed paralyzed at the audacity of the proposal, and turned away growling precisely as a savage dog does from an untried foe which it is doubtful about attacking. This did not please his friends at all, and they were so earnest on the subject, that I began to fear—the more so, as he seemed an unpopular character among them—that they might tie him up, and insist on the operation being performed. After this I established himself behind a bush close by, and consoled myself with examining and handling his matchlock in a way which showed how his thoughts were running; for he aimed at me with it more than once, when he thought I was not observing. The cord not being lighted, there was no danger in this; but when he rose, lighted a large pipe, and took it over to his lair, I thought it expedient to speak to his affectionate friends on the subject, whereon there arose a bad man, and took his gun away from him. There was no great chances of the laws of hospitality being broken; but the possibility of the ruffian wreaking his vengeance on the un

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1857.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The Message is inordinately long. As we predicted, the President declaims against the banking system, but advises no radical remedy for it. The constitutionality of State banks is admitted, and there is no hope of reform in their management, he assumes, except in State legislation. All that he says of the evils of banking has been much better said in the newspapers.

The Central American Question, after some discussion, is disposed of with the remark that Great Britain has lately made new overtures, in a friendly spirit, which are taken into consideration.

The tone of the Message towards Great Britain is civil, but towards France and Russia, cordial. As to Spain, there is the usual budget of grievances, and lo! the Amistad claim is urged upon Congress. Our other foreign relations are peaceful enough.

On the Kansas Question he reiterates the views expressed in his reply to the Silliman Letter. He expatiates on popular sovereignty, thinks the example set in Minnesota of voting on the Constitution a good one, took it for granted the Convention in Kansas would follow it, and therefore instructed Governor Walker accordingly, thinks however the Kansas-Nebraska Act did not bind the Convention to submit the whole Constitution, rejoices that at last it decided to submit the only question at issue, hopes now the matter will be settled, and if the People of Kansas do not vote, the fault will be their own. The fundamental point of difference between himself and Walker he thus sinks over, and is totally silent as to the course of the Governor.

He proclaims his purpose to suppress the Mormon rebellion, and asks for four additional regiments.

He commits himself to the policy of a Pacific railroad, and makes favors a Southern route. Ten additional war steamers are recommended. He disconrses against land speculation. He thinks it well enough at present to let the Tariff alone. Possibly a resort to Treasury notes may become necessary.

This is the sum and substance of the Message.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE IN THE SENATE.

Mr. Douglas, on the conclusion of the reading of the message in the Senate last Tuesday, took occasion, promptly and decidedly, to express his opposition to the President's position on the Kansas Question. Mr. Stuart, of Michigan, concurred with him. Mr. Trumbull questioned two of the positions in the speech on the Michigan Question, a passage flatly contradicting his present views. Mr. Hale, Mr. Seward, and others, added a few remarks. Messrs. Brown and Davis of Mississippi, and Mr. Mason of Virginia, sustained the President, and were surprised at Mr. Douglas, who announced his purpose to speak at large the next day.

So the debate is opened, and the Lecompton Constitution bids fair to be a miracle of a healing measure—a wonderful quietus to agitation.

It is said that many Western Democrats will oppose it to the bitter end.

In the House, after the reading of the journal, Mr. Houston moved to proceed to the election of a Printer for the Thirty-fifth Congress; on which motion he demanded the previous question, which gave rise to considerable discussion.

The President's annual message was received and read from the Clerk's desk.

KANSAS AFFAIRS.

In an editorial, two weeks ago, we took the ground that the People of Kansas ought not to vote on the fraudulent question submitted to them, but call upon the Governor to convene an extra session of the Legislature, so that through it the People might give an authoritative expression of their views. Reports from Kansas say that Mr. Stanton, acting Governor, proposed to call an extra session, provided he could have an assurance that the Legislature would refrain from general legislation. Another report states that Governor Walker hesitated at such a step, because he was uncertain whether the new or old Legislature would meet under such a call. These reports are unsatisfactory.

The House of Representatives is elected for one year, and the Governor certainly ought to know when its term of service begins and expires. If it does not expire till the first of January ensuing, a simple statement of this fact would justify his refusal to call an extra session. But, if this be the fact, what are we to think of the report that the Acting Governor was willing to issue a call, provided there should be no general legislation?

Meantime, we are assured that Gov. Walker persists in his opposition to the action of the Lecompton Convention, and is determined to do all he can to defeat it. He thinks he will be sustained by a majority of the Democratic Party, and a majority of the People of the country.

The position of Mr. Douglas is a subject of various speculation. The Republicans may be assured of one fact—he will not act with them, or separate himself from his Party: but in his Party, his ambition is always to be a leader. If he do not sustain the policy of Mr. Buchanan in relation to the Lecompton Constitution, he will endeavor so to manage his opposition as, while saving his interests with the Northern Democracy, he shall lose nothing with the Southern. His relations to the former constrain him to oppose the action of the Calhoun Convention, but there are many questions of equal if not greater interest to the Southern men, on which his co-operation with them may be all important.

It may be desirable to organize as a State New Mexico, which has elected a delegate on the Slavery issue, and which is believed by the Slave Power to be controlled by its supporters. It is desirable to organize two or three more Territories in the slaveholding section, as the germ of future States, and to open a Southern Territory among them. Now, suppose Mr. Douglas should embrace all these subjects in his programme, would the South take deadly offence at an act enabling the People of Kansas to form a State Constitution?

The People of Kansas thus far are acting wisely. They seem cool, but determined. We do not believe they will injure their cause by violence. The time for the last resort has not yet come. They have the numerical force; they have the Territorial Government; it is not certain that Congress will accept the Lecompton Constitution; the probabilities on the whole are against it; in all events, it cannot be forced through both Houses until the first of the January, the time fixed for the meeting of the next Kansas Legislature. The Free State men, therefore, have every reason to be calm, hopeful, and resolute. They will not vote at the election ordered on the 20th December; nor do we believe that they will resort to any violent measures to prevent it; but, we trust that they will appoint Committees of Vigilance at all the polls, and be ont in full force, to *take notice exactly of what is done*, and to expose what ever fraudulent transactions may be attempted. The Legislature which will meet in January will of course take instant measures for appraising Congress of the will of the People, and proceed to prepare for the vindication of the People's rights. If Congress should reject the Lecompton Constitution, well and good. If not—if it should accept it, and the attempt be then made to force it down in the throats of the majority of the People of the Territory, we do not know what course the Legislature might adopt; but we do not believe that majority would submit to any such outrage, and no American who reveres the patriots of 1776 could condemn their resistance. The doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance are fit only for slaves.

Prof. O. S. Fowler, widely known as a lecturer on phrenology and physiology, and practical delineator of character, is this winter on a professional visit through the South, and has arrived in this city. The course of lectures which he has commenced has been, thus far, largely attended, considering the conservative character of this community. We are gratified to note this fact, and we hope that he may continue to meet with liberal patronage.

PUT NOT YOUR TRUST IN—PRESIDENTS.

The letter-writers have had it for a week past that Governor Walker would be dismissed from office by President Buchanan; that he would not send in his name for the Senate to act upon. But the letter-writers are a very uncertain set of gentlemen, and their reports may be without sufficient foundation. It matters not; still, it becomes everybody, in the State of Kansas and elsewhere, to put their trust in Presidents. What a dismal line of Democrats have fallen from political position upon Kansas soil! The Administration of Mr. Pierce found it impossible to get a man who would remain in Kansas and support the Pro-Slavery party of the Territory. To fit out a Governor for that unholy purpose, it was equivalent to manufacturing a Pro-Slavery man.

Gov. Walker, if not exactly sacrificed, has already felt the cruelty of Presidential ingratitude and treachery. If we may believe the journalists of last spring, the Governor went to Kansas at the earnest solicitation of President Buchanan, and with instructions in his pocket. The people of the Territory have by no means secured a fair election upon their Constitution. The Governor, upon the strength of his instructions, promised this, and now fulfils his promise, or attempts to do so, and returns to Washington to find his friend Mr. Buchanan in the arms of the Slavery Propagandists, refusing to allow the citizens of Kansas to choose themselves a Constitution, because, forsooth, it is opposed by bitterest enemies, and ready to dismiss him from office! Who will supersede Mr. Walker, should he not return to Kansas? Is there any Northern Democrat who has still any faith in the Administration? Is there one who wishes to "retire from public life?" If so, here is an eligible opportunity, unless the Senator Ruffians get organized into a State immediately.

We doubt, in case Walker were superseded in office, whether his successor could be found off from a slave plantation, unless a member of the bogus Convention were to accept the office from the Administration. No gentleman, no man of any political position or of intelligence, would dare to be appointed to office by a Democratic Cabinet. It would seem as if the amazing fact that *all* the sober and intelligent officials sent out to Kansas have, in due time, sided with the Free State party, would open the eyes of Mr. Buchanan to the truth. How comes it that such men as Reader, Geary, and Walker, turn with loathing from the Pro-Slavery party of the Territory, while that party has endeavored to triumph by frauds, treachery, cunning violence—aye, by murder. And the Administration *persists* in shutting its eyes upon the truth.

The South will have injustice done, will not consent that the Free State men be treated fairly, and Mr. Buchanan must obey his master. Was he not elected for that purpose?

THE NEW YORK CITY ELECTION.

The most exciting municipal election of the year has just passed off in the city of New York. Republicans, Americans, and a wing of the Democracy, united upon one candidate, Daniel F. Tiemann, Esq., for Mayor, to defeat Fernando Wood. The ability of the latter-named gentleman is unquestioned, and he left no stone unturned to secure an election—but he was defeated, and by 4,000 votes. The official vote is at the present writing not recorded. An exchange says:

"The total vote cast on Tuesday was 84,233, and, at the Mayor's election last year, 79,931. Increase this year, 4,302. The increase since the State election last month (when the Democrats carried the city by some 16,000 majority) is about 25,000 votes.

"The Republicans have elected 10 aldermen and 17 councilmen, and the opposition 7 aldermen and 7 councilmen. Of the police justices, the Democrats have 5 and the opposition 3; of the civil justices, the Democrats 3 and the opposition 4. The supervisors and governors of the almshouse are equally divided between Democrats and Republicans."

The New York *Courier* (Tiemann paper) says:

"Never was a local election held in this city which excited such a profound and all-absorbing interest, and was attended with so few disorders. The day was one of quiet all the day. The rowdies were awed into decency by the strong police force on hand at the several polls, and the liquor stores, in the majority of cases, were closed. The people came to the ballot-box in a spirit of quiet acquiescence with the requirements of the law.

"All the arrangements made by the police commissioners were on the most complete scale. Two regular patrolmen were stationed at each poll, and a squad of special policemen patrolled in and down the streets. The police commissioners and the deputy superintendent of police were on hand at the Broom street headquarters, to readmake all arrangements upon any case of riot that might occur. Mr. Talmadge took a carriage, and, in company with Senator Douglas and Governor Crittenden, rode through the principal streets, and visited the polls in the furthest outskirts, and were gratified at the peace and good order which, with some trifling exceptions, was universally prevalent."

☞ Senator Douglas entered Washington last week, Wednesday evening, and was welcomed by the roar of artillery and the blazing of bonfires. The public is anxious to learn what will be his course upon the Kansas question. Will he stand by his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, or will he back down before the frowns or blandishments of the Administration?

The People of Kansas thus far are acting wisely. They seem cool, but determined. We do not believe they will injure their cause by violence. The time for the last resort has not yet come. They have the numerical force; they have the Territorial Government; it is not certain that Congress will accept the Lecompton Constitution; the probabilities on the whole are against it; in all events, it cannot be forced through both Houses until the first of the January, the time fixed for the meeting of the next Kansas Legislature. The Free State men, therefore, have every reason to be calm, hopeful, and resolute. They will not vote at the election ordered on the 20th December; nor do we believe that they will resort to any violent measures to prevent it; but, we trust that they will appoint Committees of Vigilance at all the polls, and be ont in full force, to *take notice exactly of what is done*, and to expose what ever fraudulent transactions may be attempted. The Legislature which will meet in January will of course take instant measures for appraising Congress of the will of the People, and proceed to prepare for the vindication of the People's rights. If Congress should reject the Lecompton Constitution, well and good. If not—if it should accept it, and the attempt be then made to force it down in the throats of the majority of the People of the Territory, we do not know what course the Legislature might adopt; but we do not believe that majority would submit to any such outrage, and no American who reveres the patriots of 1776 could condemn their resistance. The doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance are fit only for slaves.

Prof. O. S. Fowler, widely known as a lecturer on phrenology and physiology, and practical delineator of character, is this winter on a professional visit through the South, and has arrived in this city. The course of lectures which he has commenced has been, thus far, largely attended, considering the conservative character of this community. We are gratified to note this fact, and we hope that he may continue to meet with liberal patronage.

PUT NOT YOUR TRUST IN—PRESIDENTS.

The letter-writers have had it for a week past that Governor Walker would be dismissed from office by President Buchanan; that he would not send in his name for the Senate to act upon. But the letter-writers are a very uncertain set of gentlemen, and their reports may be without sufficient foundation. It matters not; still, it becomes everybody, in the State of Kansas and elsewhere, to put their trust in Presidents. What a dismal line of Democrats have fallen from political position upon Kansas soil! The Administration of Mr. Pierce found it impossible to get a man who would remain in Kansas and support the Pro-Slavery party of the Territory. To fit out a Governor for that unholy purpose, it was equivalent to manufacturing a Pro-Slavery man.

Gov. Walker, if not exactly sacrificed, has already felt the cruelty of Presidential ingratitude and treachery. If we may believe the journalists of last spring, the Governor went to Kansas at the earnest solicitation of President Buchanan, and with instructions in his pocket. The people of the Territory have by no means secured a fair election upon their Constitution. The Governor, upon the strength of his instructions, promised this, and now fulfils his promise, or attempts to do so, and returns to Washington to find his friend Mr. Buchanan in the arms of the Slavery Propagandists, refusing to allow the citizens of Kansas to choose themselves a Constitution, because, forsooth, it is opposed by bitterest enemies, and ready to dismiss him from office! Who will supersede Mr. Walker, should he not return to Kansas? Is there any Northern Democrat who has still any faith in the Administration? Is there one who wishes to "retire from public life?" If so, here is an eligible opportunity, unless the Senator Ruffians get organized into a State immediately.

We doubt, in case Walker were superseded in office, whether his successor could be found off from a slave plantation, unless a member of the bogus Convention were to accept the office from the Administration. No gentleman, no man of any political position or of intelligence, would dare to be appointed to office by a Democratic Cabinet. It would seem as if the amazing fact that *all* the sober and intelligent officials sent out to Kansas have, in due time, sided with the Free State party, would open the eyes of Mr. Buchanan to the truth. How comes it that such men as Reader, Geary, and Walker, turn with loathing from the Pro-Slavery party of the Territory, while that party has endeavored to triumph by frauds, treachery, cunning violence—aye, by murder. And the Administration *persists* in shutting its eyes upon the truth.

The South will have injustice done, will not consent that the Free State men be treated fairly, and Mr. Buchanan must obey his master. Was he not elected for that purpose?

THE NEW YORK CITY ELECTION.

The most exciting municipal election of the year has just passed off in the city of New York. Republicans, Americans, and a wing of the Democracy, united upon one candidate, Daniel F. Tiemann, Esq., for Mayor, to defeat Fernando Wood. The ability of the latter-named gentleman is unquestioned, and he left no stone unturned to secure an election—but he was defeated, and by 4,000 votes. The official vote is at the present writing not recorded. An exchange says:

"The total vote cast on Tuesday was 84,233, and, at the Mayor's election last year, 79,931. Increase this year, 4,302. The increase since the State election last month (when the Democrats carried the city by some 16,000 majority) is about 25,000 votes.

"The Republicans have elected 10 aldermen and 17 councilmen, and the opposition 7 aldermen and 7 councilmen. Of the police justices, the Democrats have 5 and the opposition 3; of the civil justices, the Democrats 3 and the opposition 4. The supervisors and governors of the almshouse are equally divided between Democrats and Republicans."

The New York *Courier* (Tiemann paper) says:

"Never was a local election held in this city which excited such a profound and all-absorbing interest, and was attended with so few disorders. The day was one of quiet all the day. The rowdies were awed into decency by the strong police force on hand at the several polls, and the liquor stores, in the majority of cases, were closed. The people came to the ballot-box in a spirit of quiet acquiescence with the requirements of the law.

"All the arrangements made by the police commissioners were on the most complete scale. Two regular patrolmen were stationed at each poll, and a squad of special policemen patrolled in and down the streets. The police commissioners and the deputy superintendent of police were on hand at the Broom street headquarters, to readmake all arrangements upon any case of riot that might occur. Mr. Talmadge took a carriage, and, in company with Senator Douglas and Governor Crittenden, rode through the principal streets, and visited the polls in the furthest outskirts, and were gratified at the peace and good order which, with some trifling exceptions, was universally prevalent."

☞ Senator Douglas entered Washington last week, Wednesday evening, and was welcomed by the roar of artillery and the blazing of bonfires. The public is anxious to learn what will be his course upon the Kansas question. Will he stand by his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, or will he back down before the frowns or blandishments of the Administration?

☞ N. R. Stimson, proprietor of the *N. Y. Day Book*, died suddenly in the cars, while on his way to his residence, one day last week. He was a man universally esteemed in the Harlem Valley, and put to shame many a Northern editor who, while acknowledging Slavery to be a grievous wrong, does all he can to uphold it.

The Louisville (Ky.) *Democrat* says, respecting the Kansas troubles:

"It is the duty of the Democratic party to settle the affairs of Kansas by the straightforward policy they have laid down and pledged themselves to. The people of Kansas have to fix their own institutions, and are to have a fair opportunity to do it. * * * It is unbecoming a great party to swerve from principle, from favor or resentment toward any party. It were infinitely better for the South to lose a dozen such States as Kansas, than to allow even a suspicion that she had countenanced any fraud or juggling for her benefit. * * * We are of opinion that the refusal to submit the Constitution entire to the popular vote will be fatal to its acceptance by Congress. * * * Kansas is not a State yet, and there is no sovereignty about the Convention. If it had been so, was, the people are to settle the institutions of Kansas—not the people by a fiction of law, but the real people. * * * The Constitution is not submitted to the people, and no reason can be given for the omission, except the apprehension that it might be voted down. Will the other States accept of dragging a State into the Union that does not wish to come in on the conditions proposed? They cannot do it, and we may safely predict they will not do it."

Half the Democratic journals of the *free* States have less disposition to do justice to Kansas than this slave State press.

Mr. Sumner's Health.—Mr. Sumner has returned from Europe, as our readers are aware, and is in Washington. We clip the following below, respecting his health, from the Boston Daily *Advertiser:*

"Mr. Sumner has gained very much by his travels, and his general health is all that can be desired. But we have been disappointed at learning that the injuries which he originally received still make themselves felt in a most important part of the system. The medical men both in this country and America, who were considered his case, concur that, with proper caution, his complete restoration is certain; but it will be the work of time, and may be entirely arrested by any attempt at labor. The European authorities (among whom are some of the highest names of science) advised against his presence in Congress, or any other public action, and went so far as to say, in a written opinion which we have read, that he did it at the 'peril of life.' Mr. Sumner's medical adviser in Boston, who has carefully considered his case since his return, is unwilling that he should take his seat in Congress at the present session, except with the understanding that he shall content himself with the simplest discharge of his duties, without any active participation in the public business. And this opinion is of the highest value, as it is the concurrence of other distinguished members of the profession."

EXTRA SESSION OF THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE.

The Kansas journals call loudly for an extra session of the recently-elected Legislature, to provide for the present emergency. Authority to call such a session is found in the thirtieth section of the organic act, and in the following words:

"*Provided*, That there shall be but one session of the Legislature annually, *unless*, on an *extraordinary occasion*, the Governor shall think another session necessary."—Italics together."

The *Herald of Freedom* remarks:

"The 'extraordinary occasion' has certainly arrived, and no person will doubt the right or duty of the Governor to advise with the Legislature on a matter of such vital importance.

"But one of our cautious readers inquires—'If an extra session of the Legislative Assembly is called, members will not be in the old one—the one which imposed this illegitimate Convention upon us?" We answer, not by any means. The 22d section of the organic act provides for the election of a Legislative Assembly at 'such time * * * as the Governor shall appoint and direct.' A precedent and sentence of the section provides that 'the term of service of the Council shall be two years,' and 'the term of service for a member of the House of Representatives shall continue one year.' The Legislative Assembly officers was held on the 30th of March, 1855, under Governor Reeder's proclamation. It follows that each Councilman's term of service expired on the 30th of March, 1857, and those elected to supersede them must have dated the commencement of their term of service back to the time when the term of their predecessors expired. Of course, then, each branch of the Legislative Assembly, just elected, dates back its term of office to the 30th of March last; and the Council term will expire on the 30th of March next."

If, on the 1st of April next, Kansas remains a Territory, unless provision is made for an early election, it will be without a Legislature, according to this mode of reckoning.

INDEPENDENCE OF VOTING.

"It seems to us clearly the interest and the necessity of the majority of the People of Kansas to secure their independence of the Federal Government, the Democratic Party of the People and the fear of the national authority which prevents them from taking the management of their own affairs into their own hands. Their true remedy is the control of this contest; and this would be completely and effectually accomplished by their admission as a State into the Union. They would then have precisely the same control over their own affairs that the people of Massachusetts or Virginia have. They could summon a Convention, frame a Constitution without let or hinderance, and carry it into effect within a month from the date of their admission, if they should see fit. This might be a revolution, but it would be a peaceful, as a successful revolution. They would fight it out among themselves. The Federal Government could not interfere. For a State election last month (when the Democrats carried the city by some 16,000 majority) is about 25,000 votes.

"The Republicans have elected 10 aldermen and 17 councilmen, and the opposition 7 aldermen and 7 councilmen. Of the police justices, the Democrats have 5 and the opposition 3; of the civil justices, the Democrats 3 and the opposition 4. The supervisors and governors of the almshouse are equally divided between Democrats and Republicans."

The New York *Courier* (Tiemann paper) says:

"Never was a local election held in this city which excited such a profound and all-absorbing interest, and was attended with so few disorders. The day was one of quiet all the day. The rowdies were awed into decency by the strong police force on hand at the several polls, and the liquor stores, in the majority of cases, were closed. The people came to the ballot-box in a spirit of quiet acquiescence with the requirements of the law.

"All the arrangements made by the police commissioners were on the most complete scale. Two regular patrolmen were stationed at each poll, and a squad of special policemen patrolled in and down the streets. The police commissioners and the deputy superintendent of police were on hand at the Broom street headquarters, to readmake all arrangements upon any case of riot that might occur. Mr. Talmadge took a carriage, and, in company with Senator Douglas and Governor Crittenden, rode through the principal streets, and visited the polls in the furthest outskirts, and were gratified at the peace and good order which, with some trifling exceptions, was universally prevalent."

☞ Senator Douglas entered Washington last week, Wednesday evening, and was welcomed by the roar of artillery and the blazing of bonfires. The public is anxious to learn what will be his course upon the Kansas question. Will he stand by his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, or will he back down before the frowns or blandishments of the Administration?

The People of Kansas thus far are acting wisely. They seem cool, but determined. We do not believe they will injure their cause by violence. The time for the last resort has not yet come. They have the numerical force; they have the Territorial Government; it is not certain that Congress will accept the Lecompton Constitution; the probabilities on the whole are against it; in all events, it cannot be forced through both Houses until the first of the January, the time fixed for the meeting of the next Kansas Legislature. The Free State men, therefore, have every reason to be calm, hopeful, and resolute. They will not vote at the election ordered on the 20th December; nor do we believe that they will resort to any violent measures to prevent it; but, we trust that they will appoint Committees of Vigilance at all the polls, and be ont in full force, to *take notice exactly of what is done*, and to expose what ever fraudulent transactions may be attempted. The Legislature which will meet in January will of course take instant measures for appraising Congress of the will of the People, and proceed to prepare for the vindication of the People's rights. If Congress should reject the Lecompton Constitution, well and good. If not—if it should accept it, and the attempt be then made to force it down in the throats of the majority of the People of the Territory, we do not know what course the Legislature might adopt; but we do not believe that majority would submit to any such outrage, and no American who reveres the patriots of 1776 could condemn their resistance. The doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance are fit only for slaves.

Prof. O. S. Fowler, widely known as a lecturer on phrenology and physiology, and practical delineator of character, is this winter on a professional visit through the South, and has arrived in this city. The course of lectures which he has commenced has been, thus far, largely attended, considering the conservative character of this community. We are gratified to note this fact, and we hope that he may continue to meet with liberal patronage.

PUT NOT YOUR TRUST IN—PRESIDENTS.

The letter-writers have had it for a week past that Governor Walker would be dismissed from office by President Buchanan; that he would not send in his name for the Senate to act upon. But the letter-writers are a very uncertain set of gentlemen, and their reports may be without sufficient foundation. It matters not; still, it becomes everybody, in the State of Kansas and elsewhere, to put their trust in Presidents. What a dismal line of Democrats have fallen from political position upon Kansas soil! The Administration of Mr. Pierce found it impossible to get a man who would remain in Kansas and support the Pro-Slavery party of the Territory. To fit out a Governor for that unholy purpose, it was equivalent to manufacturing a Pro-Slavery man.

Gov. Walker, if not exactly sacrificed, has already felt the cruelty of Presidential ingratitude and treachery. If we may believe the journalists of last spring, the Governor went to Kansas at the earnest solicitation of President Buchanan, and with instructions in his pocket. The people of the Territory have by no means secured a fair election upon their Constitution. The Governor, upon the strength of his instructions, promised this, and now fulfils his promise, or attempts to do so, and returns to Washington to find his friend Mr. Buchanan in the arms of the Slavery Propagandists, refusing to allow the citizens of Kansas to choose themselves a Constitution, because, forsooth, it is opposed by bitterest enemies, and ready to dismiss him from office! Who will supersede Mr. Walker, should he not return to Kansas? Is there any Northern Democrat who has still any faith in the Administration? Is there one who wishes to "retire from public life?" If so, here is an eligible opportunity, unless the Senator Ruffians get organized into a State immediately.

We doubt, in case Walker were superseded in office, whether his successor could be found off from a slave plantation, unless a member of the bogus Convention were to accept the office from the Administration. No gentleman, no man of any political position or of intelligence, would dare to be appointed to office by a Democratic Cabinet. It would seem as if the amazing fact that *all* the sober and intelligent officials sent out to Kansas have, in due time, sided with the Free State party, would open the eyes of Mr. Buchanan to the truth. How comes it that such men as Reader, Geary, and Walker, turn with loathing from the Pro-Slavery party of the Territory, while that party has endeavored to triumph by frauds, treachery, cunning violence—aye, by murder. And the Administration *persists* in shutting its eyes upon the truth.

The South will have injustice done, will not consent that the Free State men be treated fairly, and Mr. Buchanan must obey his master. Was he not elected for that purpose?

THE NEW YORK CITY ELECTION.

The most exciting municipal election of the year has just passed off in the city of New York. Republicans, Americans, and a wing of the Democracy, united upon one candidate, Daniel F. Tiemann, Esq., for Mayor, to defeat Fernando Wood. The ability of the latter-named gentleman is unquestioned, and he left no stone unturned to secure an election—but he was defeated, and by 4,000 votes. The official vote is at the present writing not recorded. An exchange says:

"The total vote cast on Tuesday was 84,233, and, at the Mayor's election last year, 79,931. Increase this year, 4,302. The increase since the State election last month (when the Democrats carried the city by some 16,000 majority) is about 25,000 votes.

"The Republicans have elected 10 aldermen and 17 councilmen, and the opposition 7 aldermen and 7 councilmen. Of the police justices, the Democrats have 5 and the opposition 3; of the civil justices, the Democrats 3 and the opposition 4. The supervisors and governors of the almshouse are equally divided between Democrats and Republicans."

The New York *Courier* (Tiemann paper) says:

"Never was a local election held in this city which excited such a profound and all-absorbing interest, and was attended with so few disorders. The day was one of quiet all the day. The rowdies were awed into decency by the strong police force on hand at the several polls, and the liquor stores, in the majority of cases, were closed. The people came to the ballot-box in a spirit of quiet acquiescence with the requirements of the law.

"All the arrangements made by the police commissioners were on the most complete scale. Two regular patrolmen were stationed at each poll, and a squad of special policemen patrolled in and down the streets. The police commissioners and the deputy superintendent of police were on hand at the Broom street headquarters, to readmake all arrangements upon any case of riot that might occur. Mr. Talmadge took a carriage, and, in company with Senator Douglas and Governor Crittenden, rode through the principal streets, and visited the polls in the furthest outskirts, and were gratified at the peace and good order which, with some trifling exceptions, was universally prevalent."

☞ Senator Douglas entered Washington last week, Wednesday evening, and was welcomed by the roar of artillery and the blazing of bonfires. The public is anxious to learn what will be his course upon the Kansas question. Will he stand by his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, or will he back down before the frowns or blandishments of the Administration?

The Louisville (Ky.) *Democrat* says, respecting the Kansas troubles:

"It is the duty of the Democratic party to settle the affairs of Kansas by the straightforward policy they have laid down and pledged themselves to. The people of Kansas have to fix their own institutions, and are to have a fair opportunity to do it. * * * It is unbecoming a great party to swerve from principle, from favor or resentment toward any party. It were infinitely better for the South to lose a dozen such States as Kansas, than to allow even a suspicion that she had countenanced any fraud or juggling for her benefit. * * * We are of opinion that the refusal to submit the Constitution entire to the popular vote will be fatal to its acceptance by Congress. * * * Kansas is not a State yet, and there is no sovereignty about the Convention. If it had been so, was, the people are to settle the institutions of Kansas—not the people by a fiction of law, but the real people. * * * The Constitution is not submitted to the people, and no reason can be given for the omission, except the apprehension that it might be voted down. Will the other States accept of dragging a State into the Union that does not wish to come in on the conditions proposed? They cannot do it, and we may safely predict they will not do it."

Half the Democratic journals of the *free* States have less disposition to do justice to Kansas than this slave State press.

Mr. Sumner's Health.—Mr. Sumner has returned from Europe, as our readers are aware, and is in Washington. We clip the following below, respecting his health, from the Boston Daily *Advertiser:*

"Mr. Sumner has gained very much by his travels, and his general health is all that can be desired. But we have been disappointed at learning that the injuries which he originally received still make themselves felt in a most important part of the system. The medical men both in this country and America, who were considered his case, concur that, with proper caution, his complete restoration is certain; but it will be the work of time, and may be entirely arrested by any attempt at labor. The European authorities (among whom are some of the highest names of science) advised against his presence in Congress, or any other public action, and went so far as to say, in a written opinion which we have read, that he did it at the 'peril of life.' Mr. Sumner's medical adviser in Boston, who has carefully considered his case since his return, is unwilling that he should take his seat in Congress at the present session, except with the understanding that he shall content himself with the simplest discharge of his duties, without any active participation in the public business. And this opinion is of the highest value, as it is the concurrence of other distinguished members of the profession."

EXTRA SESSION OF THE KANSAS LEGISLATURE.

The Kansas journals call loudly for an extra session of the recently-elected Legislature, to provide for the present emergency. Authority to call such a session is found in the thirtieth section of the organic act, and in the following words:

"*Provided*, That there shall be but one session of the Legislature annually, *unless*, on an *extraordinary occasion*, the Governor shall think another session necessary."—Italics together."

The *Herald of Freedom* remarks:

"The 'extraordinary occasion' has certainly arrived, and no person will doubt the right or duty of the Governor to advise with the Legislature on a matter of such vital importance.

"But one of our cautious readers inquires—'If an extra session of the Legislative Assembly is called, members will not be in the old one—the one which imposed this illegitimate Convention upon us?" We answer, not by any means. The 22d section of the organic act provides for the election of a Legislative Assembly at 'such time * * * as the Governor shall appoint and direct.' A precedent and sentence of the section provides that 'the term of service of the Council shall be two years,' and 'the term of service for a member of the House of Representatives shall continue one year.' The Legislative Assembly officers was held on the 30th of March, 1855, under Governor Reeder's proclamation. It follows that each Councilman's term of service expired on the 30th of March, 1857, and those elected to supersede them must have dated the commencement of their term of service back to the time when the term of their predecessors expired. Of course, then, each branch of the Legislative Assembly, just elected, dates back its term of office to the 30th of March last; and the Council term will expire on the 30th of March next."

If, on the 1st of April next, Kansas remains a Territory, unless provision is made for an early election, it will be without a Legislature, according to this mode of reckoning.

INDEPENDENCE OF VOTING.

"It seems to us clearly the interest and the necessity of the majority of the People of Kansas to secure their independence of the Federal Government, the Democratic Party of the People and the fear of the national authority which prevents them from taking the management of their own affairs into their own hands. Their true remedy is the control of this contest; and this would be completely and effectually accomplished by their admission as a State into the Union. They would then have precisely the same control over their own affairs that the people of Massachusetts or Virginia have. They could summon a Convention, frame a Constitution without let or hinderance, and carry it into effect within a month from the date of their admission, if they should see fit. This might be a revolution, but it would be a peaceful, as a successful revolution. They would fight it out among themselves. The Federal Government could not interfere. For a State election last month (when the Democrats carried the city by some 16,000 majority) is about 25,000 votes.

"The Republicans have elected 10 aldermen and 17 councilmen, and the opposition 7 aldermen and 7 councilmen. Of the police justices, the Democrats have 5 and the opposition 3; of the civil justices, the Democrats 3 and the opposition 4. The supervisors and governors of the almshouse are equally divided between Democrats and Republicans."

The New York *Courier* (Tiemann paper) says:

"Never was a local election held in this city which excited such a profound and all-absorbing interest, and was attended with so few disorders. The day was one of quiet all the day. The rowdies were awed into decency by the strong police force on hand at the several polls, and the liquor stores, in the majority of cases, were closed. The people came to the ballot-box in a spirit of quiet acquiescence with the requirements of the law.

"All the arrangements made by the police commissioners were on the most complete scale. Two regular patrolmen were stationed at each poll, and a squad of special policemen patrolled in and down the streets. The police commissioners and the deputy superintendent of police were on hand at the Broom street headquarters, to readmake all arrangements upon any case of riot that might occur. Mr. Talmadge took a carriage, and, in company with Senator Douglas and Governor Crittenden, rode through the principal streets, and visited the polls in the furthest outskirts, and were gratified at the peace and good order which, with some trifling exceptions, was universally prevalent."

☞ Senator Douglas entered Washington last week, Wednesday evening, and was welcomed by the roar of artillery and the blazing of bonfires. The public is anxious to learn what will be his course upon the Kansas question. Will he stand by his doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, or will he back down before the frowns or blandishments of the Administration?

The People of Kansas thus far are acting wisely. They seem cool, but determined. We do not believe they will injure their cause by violence. The time for the last resort has not yet come. They have the numerical force; they have the Territorial Government; it is not certain that Congress will accept the Lecompton Constitution; the probabilities on the whole are against it; in all events, it cannot be forced through both Houses until the first of the January, the time fixed for the meeting of the next Kansas Legislature. The Free State men, therefore, have every reason to be calm, hopeful, and resolute. They will not vote at the election ordered on the 20th December; nor do we believe that they will resort to any violent measures to prevent it; but, we trust that they will appoint Committees of Vigilance at all the polls, and be ont in full force, to *take notice exactly of what is done*, and to expose what ever fraudulent transactions may be attempted. The Legislature which will meet in January

PRESENT'S MESSAGE.

Fellow-citizens of the Senate
and House of Representatives:

In obedience to the command of the Constitution, it has now become my duty "to give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and to recommend to their consideration such measures" as I judge to be "necessary and expedient."

But first, and above all, our thanks are due to Almighty God for the numerous benefits which He has bestowed upon this people and which our prayers ought to ascend to Him, that He would continue to bless our great Republic in time to come as He has so signally done in past. Since the adjournment of the last Congress, our constituents have enjoyed an unusual degree of health. The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly, and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the husbandman. Our great staples have commanded high prices, and, up till within a few months, all the departments of manufacturing and mechanical occupations have largely partaken of the general prosperity. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in such abundance, that the superabundance, after affording to our domestic manufactures by the present revenue tariff. But for this, the branches of our manufactures composed of raw materials, the production of core of the country—such as cotton, iron, and woollen fabrics—would not have been enabled to withstand exclusive possession of the home market, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. Fortunately for the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, whilst the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.

Under these circumstances, a loan may be required before the end of the year of the present session; but this, although deeply to be regretted, would prove to be only a slight misfortune, when compared with the suffering and distress prevailing in other countries. With the Union, the Government cannot fail deeply to sympathize, though it may be without the power to extend relief.

It is our duty to inquire what has produced such unfortunate results, and whether their recurrence can be prevented? In all former revulsions, the blame might, in part, have been fairly attributed to a variety of co-operating causes; but not so upon the present occasion. It is apparent that our existing misfortunes have proceeded solely from the extravagant and vicious system of paper currency and bank credits, exciting the people to wild speculations and gambling in the public lands. Revulsions must continue to recur at successive intervals so long as the amount of the paper currency and bank loans and discounts of the country shall be left to the discretion of more than hundred irresponsible banking institutions, which the law of their nature will consult the interest of their stockholders rather than the public welfare.

The framers of the Constitution, when they gave to Congress the power "to coin money and to regulate the value thereof," never exhibited the States from coining money, emitting bills of credit, or making anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts, supposed they protected the people against the evils of an excessive and irredeemable paper currency. They are not responsible for the present state of things. Congress is endowed with the sovereign attribute of coining money and regulating the value thereof should have no power to prevent others from driving this coin out of circulation, and filling the channels of circulation with paper which does not represent gold and silver.

It is the part of wisdom to avoid most responsible duties of Government, to insure to the people a sound circulating medium, the amount of which ought to be adapted with the utmost possible wisdom to the wants of the various internal trade and foreign exchanges. If this be either greatly above or greatly below the proper standard, the marketable value of every man's property is increased or diminished in the same proportion, and injustice to individuals as well as inconvenience to the community are the consequences.

Unfortunately, under the construction of the State banking system which has now prevailed for forty years, the amount of the currency is not determined by the wisdom of Congress, but by the independent action of the banks throughout the Union. Each bank is entitled to issue paper money to the amount of its capital stock, and to loan and circulate the same amount. Thus the circulation of the country may be said to depend upon the will of the banks, and the conduct of each one of them has a powerful influence upon the whole system. Should they all, or any considerable number of them, for their own interest, suddenly curtail their issues

Power on earth to the strictest account for not preventing such enormities.

Ever since the Administration of General Washington, acts of Congress have been in force to punish severely the crime of setting on foot a military expedition within the limits of the United States, to proceed from thence against a nation or State with whom we are at peace. The present neutrality act of April 20, 1818, is but little more than a collection of pre-existing laws. Under this act, the President is empowered to employ the land and naval forces and the militia, "for the purpose of preventing the carrying on of any such expedition or enterprise from the territories and jurisdiction of the United States;" and to detain any offending vessel, and to seize and forfeit the same, when it is found to be intended for such unlawful enterprises.

When it was first rendered probable that an attempt would be made to get up another unlawful expedition against Cuba, the Secretary of State issued instructions to the Marshals and District Attorneys, which were directed by the Secretaries of War and the Navy to the appropriate army and navy officers, requiring them to be vigilant, and to use their best exertions in carrying into effect the provisions of the act of 1818. Notwithstanding these instructions, the expedition has escaped from our shores. Such enterprises can do no possible good to the country, but have already inflicted much injury both on the national and the state character. They have prevented peaceful emigration from the United States to the States of Central America, which would not fail to prove highly beneficial to all the parties concerned. In a pecuniary point of view alone, our citizens have sustained heavy losses from the seizure and detention of the steamer Crescent City on the San Juan between the two oceans.

The leader of the recent expedition was arrested at Mobile, by the United States marshal, on giving bail for his appearance in the insufficient sum of two thousand dollars.

I commend the whole subject to the serious attention of Congress, both for the sake of duty and our interest, as well as our national character; require that we should adopt such measures as will be effectual in restraining our citizens from committing such outrages.

I regret to inform you that the President of Paraguay has refused to ratify the treaty between the United States and that State, which was signed, on the Senate, the signature of which was mentioned in the message of my predecessor to Congress, at the opening of its session in December, 1853. The correspondence on this refusal will appear in the correspondence herewith submitted.

It being desirable to ascertain the fitness of the river La Plata and its tributaries for navigation by steam, the United States steamer Water Witch was sent thither for that purpose in 1853. The service was successfully performed until February, 1855, when, whilst in the peaceful prosecution of her voyage up the Parana from Buenos Ayres, she was fired upon by a Paraguayan fort. The fire was returned; but as the Water Witch was of small force, and not designed for offensive operations, she retired from the contest. The copy of a protest against this attack was made as a decree of the President of Paraguay, of October, 1854, prohibiting foreign vessels of war from navigating the rivers of that State. As Paraguay, however, is not the owner of but one bank of the river of that name, the other belonging to Corrientes, a State of the Argentine Confederation, it is due to the Government to expect that such a decree would be obeyed cannot be acknowledged. But the Water Witch was not, properly speaking, a vessel of war. She was a surveying vessel, engaged in a scientific enterprise intended for the advantage of commercial States generally. Under these circumstances, I have contained to consider the attack upon her as unjustifiable, and as calling for satisfaction from the Paraguayan Government.

Citizens of the United States, also, who were established in business in Paraguay, have had their property seized and taken from them, and have otherwise been treated by the authorities in an insulting and arbitrary manner, which requires redress.

A demand for these purposes will be made in a firm but respectful tone. If justice shall not be more probably be granted, if the Executive shall have authority to use other means in the event of a refusal. This is accordingly recommended.

It is unnecessary for me to call your attention to the alarming condition of the Territory of Kansas at the time of my inauguration. The opposing parties then were in battle array against each other, and any accident might have relighted the flames of civil war. Besides, at this critical moment, Kansas was left without a Government, by the resignation of Gov. Walker.

On the 19th of February previous, the Territorial Legislature had passed a law providing for the election of delegates on the third Monday of June, to a Convention to meet on the first Monday of September, for the purpose of framing a Constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union. This act was the work of the majority of the Legislature, who were the main fair and just, and it is to be regretted that all the qualified electors had not registered themselves, and voted under its provisions.

At the election of delegates, an extensive organization existed in the Territory, whose avowed object it was, if need be, to put down the Government, and to set on foot and to establish a Government of their own, under the so-called Topeka Constitution. The persons attached to this revolutionary organization abstained from taking part in the election.

The act of the Territorial Legislature had omitted to provide for submitting to the people the Constitution which might be framed by the Convention; and in the midst of the excited feeling throughout Kansas, an apprehension extensively prevailed, that a design existed to force upon the people of the Territory a form of Slavery against their will. In this emergency, it became my duty, as it was my unquestionable right, having in view the union of all good citizens in support of the Territorial Laws, to express an opinion on the true construction of the provisions concerning Slavery contained in the organic act of Congress, passed May 30th, 1854. Congress declared it to be "the true intent and meaning of this act, not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way." Under it, Kansas, "when admitted as a State, shall be received into the Union, with or without Slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission."

Did Congress, by this language that the delegates elected to frame a Constitution should have authority finally to decide the question of Slavery, or did they intend, by leaving it to the people of the Territory, that they themselves should decide this question by a direct vote? On this subject, I confess I had never entertained a doubt. Before, therefore, in my instructions to Governor Walker of the 28th March last, I merely said, that when "a Constitution shall be submitted to the people of the Territory, entire freedom must be given to the exercise of their right of voting for or against that instrument, and the fair expression of the popular will must not be interrupted by fraud or violence."

In expressing this opinion, it was far from my intention to interfere with the decision of the people on the question of Slavery. From this I have always carefully abstained. I restricted, with the duty of taking "care that the laws be faithfully executed," my only desire was that the people of Kansas should furnish to Congress the evidence required by the organic act, whether for or against Slavery, and in this manner smooth their passage into the Union. In emerging from the condition of Territorial dependence into that of a sovereign State, it was their duty, in my opinion, to make known their will by the votes of the majority, on the direct question whether this important domestic institution should or should not exist within its limits. Indeed, this was the only possible mode in which their will could be authentically ascertained.

The election of delegates to a Convention must necessarily take place in separate districts. From this cause it may readily happen, as has often been the case, that a majority of the people of a State or Territory are on one side of a question, while a majority of the Representatives from the several districts into which it is divided may be on the other. This is of importance from the fact that in some districts delegates may be elected by small majorities, whilst in others scores of different sentiments may receive majorities sufficiently great not only to overcome the votes given for the former, but to leave a large majority of the whole people in direct opposition to the majority of the delegates. Besides, our history proves that influences may be brought to bear on the Representative, sufficiently powerful to induce him to disregard the will of his constituents. The truth is, that no other authentic and satisfactory mode exists of ascertaining the will of a majority of the people of any State or Territory on an important and exciting question like that of Slavery in Kansas, except by leaving it to a direct vote. How wise, then, was it for Congress to pass general laws, and to refer their application to the people, and proceed directly to the source of all legitimate power under our institutions!

How vain would any other principle prove in practice! This was fully illustrated by the case of Kansas. Should she be admitted into the Union, with a Constitution either maintaining or abolishing Slavery, against the sentiments of the majority of her people, a spirit of discontent would be aroused, and resistance to any other act than to continue and to exasperate the existing agitation during the brief period required to make the Constitution conform to the irresistible will of the majority.

The friends and supporters of the Nebraska and Kansas act, when engaged in the struggle on a former occasion to maintain it by the votes of the great tribunal of the American people, never differed about its true meaning on this subject. They repudiated the construction, upon they publicly pledged their faith and their honor, that they would cheerfully submit the question of Slavery to the decision of the *bona fide* people of the Territory, without restriction or qualification whatever. All were cordially united upon the great doctrine of popular sovereignty, which is the vital principle of our free institutions. They did not differ in the same state any quarter that it would be a sufficient compliance with the requisitions of the organic law for the measure to be submitted to the people to be elected, to withhold the question of Slavery from the people, and to substitute their own will for that of a legally-ascertained majority of all those who had a right to vote, who been instantly rejected. Everywhere they remained true to the resolution adopted on a celebrated occasion, during the days of the early struggles of all the Territories—including Kansas and Nebraska—acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and not through fraud or violence. If the inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without Slavery, and be admitted into the Union on the same terms of perfect equality with the other States."

The Convention to frame a Constitution for Kansas met on the first Monday of September last. They remained in session until the 7th day of November, when they completed their work and submitted the Constitution framed by them to a subject of Slavery. The truth is, that the general provisions of our recent State Constitutions are so similar, (and, I may add, so excellent,) that but little difference between them can be expected. Under the earlier practice of the Government, no Constitution framed by the Convention of a Territory, previous to its admission into the Union as a State, had been submitted to the people. I trust, however, the example set by the last Congress, requiring that the Constitution of Minnesota should be subject to the approval and ratification of the people of the proposed State," may be followed on future occasions. And this will be granted that the Convention of Kansas would act in accordance with this example, founded as it is on correct principles; and hence my instructions to Governor Walker, in favor of submitting the Constitution to the people, were expressed in general and unqualified terms.

In the Kansas-Nebraska act, however, this requirement, as applicable to the whole Constitution, had not been inserted, and the Convention were not bound by its terms to submit any other portion of their Constitution to an election, except that which relates to the "domestic institution" of Slavery. This will be rendered clear by a simple reference to its language. It is in these words: "It being the true intent of this act not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institution in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Here, then, the distinction between master and slave and a few others are "domestic institutions," and are entirely distinct from institutions of a political character. Besides, there was no question then before Congress, nor indeed has there since been any serious proposition to the people of Kansas or the country, except that which relates to the "domestic institution" of Slavery.

The Convention, after an angry and excited debate, finally determined, by a majority of only two, to submit the question of Slavery to the people, though at the last, forty-three of the fifty delegates present affixed their signatures to the Constitution.

A large majority of the Convention were in favor of establishing Slavery in the Territory, accordingly inserted in the Constitution for this purpose, similar in form to those which had been adopted by other Territorial Conventions. At the schedule, however, providing for the transition from a Territorial to a State Government, the question has been fairly and explicitly referred to the people, whether they desire to have Slavery or not, and to vote for "Constitution with Slavery," and "Constitution without Slavery." It declares, that before the Constitution adopted by the Convention "shall be sent to Congress for admission into the Union as a State," an election shall be held to decide this question, at which all the white male inhabitants of the Territory above the age of twenty-one years may vote; that "the votes shall be polled; and "the ballots cast at said election shall be endorsed, 'Constitution with Slavery,' and 'Constitution with no Slavery.'" If there be a majority for the "Constitution with Slavery," then it is to be transmitted to Congress by the President of the Convention in its original form. If, on the contrary, there shall be a majority in favor of the "Constitution with no Slavery," then the article providing for Slavery shall be stricken from the Constitution by the President of the Convention;" and it is expressly declared that "no Slavery shall exist in the State of Kansas, except that the right of property in slaves now in the Territory shall in no manner be interfered with;" and in that event, it is made his duty to have the Constitution thus ratified transmitted to the Congress of the United States, for the admission of the State into the Union.

At this election, every citizen will have an opportunity of expressing his opinion, by his vote, whether Kansas shall be received into the Union with or without Slavery," and thus this exciting question may be peacefully settled in the very mode which the organic act designed. The election will be held under legitimate authority, and if any portion of the inhabitants shall refuse to vote, a fair opportunity to do so having been afforded, they will have their own voluntary act, and they alone will be responsible for the consequences.

Whether the Constitution shall be a free or a slave State must eventually, under some authority, be decided by an election; and the question can never be more clearly or distinctly presented to the people than it is at the present moment. Should this opportunity be rejected, she may be involved for years in domestic discord, and possibly in civil war, before she can again make up the issue now so fortunately tendered, and again reach the point she has already attained.

Kansas has for some years occupied too much of the public attention. It is high time this should be directed to far more important objects. When once admitted into the Union, Kansas will be entitled to two Senators and a Representative in the House of Representatives, "to provide and maintain a navy," and to call forth the militia to "repel invasion." Her duties, as she ought to understand, will involve important and responsible public duties, and among them there is none so sacred and so imperative as that of preserving our soil from the contamination of Slavery. The Constitution has therefore left nothing on this point to construction, but expressly requires that "the United States shall protect each of them [the States] against invasion." Now, if a military rond over our own Territories be indispensably necessary to enable us to meet and repel the invader, it follows as a necessary consequence, not only that we possess the power, but it is our imperative duty to construct such a road. It would be an absurdity to invest a Government with the faculties of self-preservation and conduct war, and at the same time deny to it the only means of reaching and defeating the enemies at the frontier. Without such a road, it is quite evident we cannot "protect" California and our Pacific possessions "against invasion." We cannot by any other means transport men and munitions of war from the Atlantic States in sufficient time successfully to defend these remote and distant portions of the Republic.

Experience has proved that the routes across the Isthmus of Central America are at best but a very uncertain and unreliable mode of communication. But even if this were not the case, would it be wise or politic to permit Great Britain, in the event of war with a naval Power so much stronger than our own as to enable it to block-ade the ports at either end of the Isthmus, after we had thrown us only rely upon a military road through our own Territories; and even since the origin of the Government, Congress has made liberal appropriations for improvements from the public treasury for the construction of such roads.

The difficulties and the expense of constructing a military railroad to connect our Atlantic and Pacific States have been greatly exaggerated. The distance on the Arizona route, near the 32d parallel of north latitude, between the western boundary of Texas on the Rio Grande and the eastern boundary of California on the Colorado, from the best explorations now within our possession, does not exceed one hundred and seventy miles, and the face of the country is, in the main, favorable. For obvious reasons, the Government ought to avoid unnecessary delay in the work itself, and in the public mails. The commercial interests of the whole country, both East and West, imperatively demand that such a road; and, above all, it would be a powerful additional bond of union. And although advantages of this kind, whether postal, commercial, or military, are always the main motives of the Mormon church will yield implicit obedience to his will. Unfortunately, existing facts leave but little room for doubt as to his determination. Without entering upon a minute history of occurrence, it is sufficient to say that all the officers of the United States, judicial and executive, have been either expelled or driven from the Territory, and there no longer remains any Government in fact or in operation, except that of Brigham Young. This being the condition of affairs in the Territory, I could not mistake the path of duty. As "Utah is a Territory of the United States, I was bound to restore the supremacy of the Constitution and laws within its limits. In order to effect this purpose, I appointed a new Governor and other officers for the Territory, and sent with them a military force for their protection, and to aid as a *posse comitatus*, in case of need, in the execution of the laws.

With the religious opinions of the Mormons, as long as they remained mere opinions, however deplorable in themselves, and revolting to the moral and religious sentiments of all Christendom, I had no right to interfere. Actions alone, when in violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States, could justify legitimate subjects for the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate. My instructions to Governor Cumming have therefore been framed in strict accordance with these principles. At a late date, a hope was indulged that no necessity might exist for employing the military in restoring and maintaining the authority of the laws; but this hope has now vanished. Gov. Young has, by proclamation, declared his determination to maintain his power by force, and has already commenced the work of hostility against the United States. Unless he should retrace his steps, the Territory of Utah will be in a state of open rebellion. He has committed these acts of hostility against the United States. Van Vliet, an officer of the army, sent to Utah by the commanding general to purchase provisions for the troops, had gone there by the most ordinary and usual route, and was engaged in the peaceful duties of his department, when he was arrested, and detained in confinement for many days. Mr. Absalom Woodworth, a postmaster, was also arrested, and detained in confinement for many days. Mr.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE NORTHERN PRESS.

From Forney's Press.

LET THE MAJORITY RULE.

It is astonishing how a great principle breaks down all opposition. It is like the resistless advance of the sparkling sunbeam, which, before it works enduring triumphs, and wields perpetual sway. Nothing can long arrest it or forever keep it back. The more it is opposed, the more certain is its final success. Neither principalities nor powers can destroy it. When the great principle of popular sovereignty was enunciated in the Kansas-Nebraska act, it encountered a torrent of assault and misrepresentation. It was so damaged to the Northern mind by its adversaries, that for some time it went down before the tide. It had a fearful struggle even in Kansas, deeply as Kansas was concerned in its success. At first, a portion of the Southern party threw a portion of the force, tried to intervene against it, but with no permanent advantage. The Administration of James Buchanan came to the rescue; and a fair election in Kansas—he upon the basis of the doctrines of popular sovereignty—was inscribed on its banners. The result we see before us in the admission of Kansas, whose fair vote was had, for the first time, in October last, and the new State will soon be started, upon the principle that *the majority shall rule*, which is the very vitality and marrow of freedom.

The public opinion manifested against the attempt of a few men in Kansas, calling themselves the Constitutional Convention of the Territory, (less than sixty in all) to make their work binding upon thousands of the people of the embryo State, without permitting the people to express their will, has once more presented a striking evidence of the tenacity with which the people adhere to a great principle, no matter who opposes it. A miserable minority faction, as this was, in Kansas, would not have been resisted, *had it not feared the ballot box*. But this fear has proved alike its own curse, and the salvation of the Administration in regard to it. This fear will annihilate its designs.

As an evidence of the great feeling of opposition to the work of the late Constitutional Convention of Kansas, which has been wrought by the act of that body in refusing to commit their own entire work to the people, whose servants they were, to take the sense of expressions of sentiment, which have just reached us by the late mails:

From the Albany Atlas and Argus, Nov. 17.—Democratic Gain in the Legislature of New York.

The only question for Congress is, has the application for admission, and the Constitution accompanying it, the assent of a majority of the people of the Territory in whose name the application is made? On this point Congress should have affirmative evidence. It should be satisfied that the majority of the people of Kansas desire admission as a State under the Lecompton Constitution. It would seem to be certain that the Administration cannot carry through Congress a Constitution that has not the will of the people represented to and approved by the people of the Territory. If they attempt to do it, they will lose a new and formidable section of their supporters in the free States, and will have the just ground of opposition for the Republicans of the North and the Americans of the South. But, on the other hand, if they abandon the Constitution which has been prepared, reject it altogether, or send it back for a vote of the people, they seem to be in equal danger from the South. The Democratic party of the South is already goaded to desperation by Governor Walker's disposition to deal fairly with the Kansas matter, and are looking for some pretext for hostile eyes on the course of the President and Cabinet. They have only been kept from open revolt, heretofore, by assurances that Governor Walker did not act without the approval of the President, and that he would be rejected by a Democratic Senate, unless Mr. Buchanan chose to recall him, or interfere with his action. The Senate might, indeed, be got rid of in one of three ways; but Mr. Calhoun's Constitution is not so easily to be escaped; the Administration must express or originate the action of Congress, or take will oblige them to face a breach of their party in Congress and the country. There is certainly the most imminent prospect of the speedy realization of such a blessing to the nation that has appeared in the political horizon since the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was succeeded by Kansas.

Of course, every possible expedient will be resorted to for the avoidance of such a result. To cheat one's self is the last thing anyone has to offend the other, has been, and still is, the whole aim and purpose of Mr. Buchanan's Administration. New efforts to do this will not be wanting, but they will fail. The truth is Sooner or later, it has always been evident the Democratic party had got to account for their fugleyy with the country upon the Kansas question. They escaped it last year, but they cannot avoid it or postpone it now. The issue is made up in two cases—Governor Walker's course in the case of Kansas, Governor Johnson and McGee counties, and in Mr. Calhoun's Constitution. Both are to come up before the new Congress as the test question upon them both the Democratic party already gives serious indications of radical division.

Justice, common sense, precedents, and the consistency of the Democratic party, and of the Government, are all on the side of the Northern section on both these questions; and when driven to an issue with the Southern section of the country will, we believe, force the Administration to fulfill its own pledges to the people of Kansas and to the country, and stand faithfully by its own Governor. If it does not, a score of Constitutions, a choice might not have been worth much; and it would be wrong to force upon a people as the fundamental instruments of Government, both of which were objectionable. The Slavery question is to be submitted by itself. By some accounts, it is the only question submitted—the voting being "For the Constitution, without the Slavery Clause." We have no doubt that, the Slavery question apart, the people would vote down upon a Constitution; but the principle involved in this method of disposing of the matter is not Democratic. An opportunity ought to be given to the people to vote for the Constitution down, no matter whether it is Pro-Slavery or Anti Slavery, if they want to.

From the Buffalo Daily Courier, (Dem.,) Nov. 17.

That the Lecompton Constitution is fatally, infallibly to express the popular will, that body has itself declared, in the act of submitting to the people their portion of its constitutional project providing for the establishment of Slavery. The only pretext upon which the Convention can claim that their decision, in respect to any of the provisions of the Constitution, is final and conclusive, rests upon a popular ratification in advance of whatever the Convention should see fit to do. Without any power thus conferred was as absolute, in respect to Slavery as to the organization of the Judiciary, or the term of office of the Governor.

Nor has any Convention any further assurance that its action in these last particulars conforms to the popular will, than in the matter of Slavery. Why, then, is only the Slavery clause submitted to the vote of the people, with no opportunity offered for rejecting the other provisions of the Constitution? If it be answered, that the public sentiment had made no question of any other provision than that of constitutional sanction than Slavery, it may be asked, What motive for withholding the other provisions from the people to pass upon their verdict is certain to be one of approval? A part of the Constitution is to be submitted for ratification; an election is to be held, all the time will be consumed, and all the excitement incurred, requisite to ascertain positively the will of the people in relation to the whole project. But this would be wrong. The will is to be conferred to only a part of it. The inference is irresistible, that any such discrimination is intended to secure the approval of those who desire to impose a Constitution upon Kansas in defiance of the popular will; and that partial submission is conceded in deference to a public sentiment that cannot safely be disregarded, and in the hope, perhaps, of mollifying the opposition that a more flagrant violation of the principle of popular sovereignty would be certain to excite. But we apprehend that the least infringement upon that principle will be as indignantly and effectually rebuked as the widest departure from it. The rights of the people are not to be trifled with. The Congress of the United States will not lend its countenance to swindling and subterfuge directed to defeat the popular will. The President of the Kansas Convention may send the Constitution to Congress, assuming the mockery of a sanction which those votes cast for Slavery will submit to be told. "The Constitution we have framed for you, you shall have; take it with Slavery or without it as you please; but in every other feature of it you must accept our dictation." But Congress will spurn the presumption and contempt of the Convention, and refuse to sanction its shameless usurpation.

From Haldeman's Parties and Union, (Dem.) Nov. 19.

Their conduct, however, [Free State men,] does not excuse the Convention for refusing to submit to the entire Constitution to the people. The Democratic party is pledged to admit Kansas with such a Constitution as a majority of her citizens shall adopt; but it must be one fairly submitted and fairly adopted. The effort to force a Constitution distasteful to the people upon them, must prove futile, and cannot be recognized by that party that established the doctrine of popular government, and are bound to see it equitably enforced.

From the Buffalo Advertiser, (Old-Line Whig,) Nov. 17.

The latest news from Kansas is of a character to arrest attention. The Convention for forming a State Constitution adjourned on Saturday, the 7th inst., having completed its labors. No provision is made for submitting the Constitution, as a whole, to the suffrages of the people, but the Convention decided to submit at an early day relating to Slavery. The people of Kansas have as clear a right to decide on the other parts of the organic law under which they are to live, as they have to say whether they will tolerate Slavery or not within their limits. We believe that this refusal to allow the people of the Territory to vote on the Constitution as a whole will immediately be the occasion of revolt in the people of the country, and that it will be so emphatically expressed before the subject comes before Congress, that that body will not venture to set it at defiance by admitting Kansas into the State. We have of late looked carefully into the leading Democratic journals of the North-ern States, with a view to gather their sentiments on this subject, and it gives us pleasure to say, that they are unanimously and warmly enlisted in defence of the right—of the right of the people of Kansas to form their own State institutions they will live. We confidently predict, therefore, that the notion of the Kansas Convention will not be sanctioned by Congress.

From the Springfield (Ill.) Republican, Nov. 23.

THE DEMOCRACY AND KANSAS.

The Administration and the Democratic party have been successful heretofore in dodging a direct issue upon the Kansas question. But they seem to be coming to it at last, and too, when they thought the plaguey trouble was over. The late action of Mr. Calhoun's Convention creates quite a disturbance among the representatives of Democracy assembled upon Washington *Union*, the ceniral Administration organ, committed itself at once, in a grand *Yea by jee* of Democracy, to the support of the Constitution. But most of the Northern Democratic papers reject it, and show more independence and determination in their articles against it, than we have seen from them for years. It would seem to be certain that the Administration cannot carry through Congress a Constitution that has not the will of the people represented to and approved by the people of the Territory. If they attempt to do it, they will lose a new and formidable section of their supporters in the free States, and will have the just ground of opposition for the Republicans of the North and the Americans of the South. But, on the other hand, if they abandon the Constitution which has been prepared, reject it altogether, or send it back for a vote of the people, they seem to be in equal danger from the South. The Democratic party of the South is already goaded to desperation by Governor Walker's disposition to deal fairly with the Kansas matter, and are looking for some pretext for hostile eyes on the course of the President and Cabinet. They have only been kept from open revolt, heretofore, by assurances that Governor Walker did not act without the approval of the President, and that he would be rejected by a Democratic Senate, unless Mr. Buchanan chose to recall him, or interfere with his action. The Senate might, indeed, be got rid of in one of three ways; but Mr. Calhoun's Constitution is not so easily to be escaped; the Administration must express or originate the action of Congress, or take will oblige them to face a breach of their party in Congress and the country. There is certainly the most imminent prospect of the speedy realization of such a blessing to the nation that has appeared in the political horizon since the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was succeeded by Kansas.

Of course, every possible expedient will be resorted to for the avoidance of such a result. To cheat one's self is the last thing anyone has to offend the other, has been, and still is, the whole aim and purpose of Mr. Buchanan's Administration. New efforts to do this will not be wanting, but they will fail. The truth is Sooner or later, it has always been evident the Democratic party had got to account for their fugleyy with the country upon the Kansas question. They escaped it last year, but they cannot avoid it or postpone it now. The issue is made up in two cases—Governor Walker's course in the case of Kansas, Governor Johnson and McGee counties, and in Mr. Calhoun's Constitution. Both are to come up before the new Congress as the test question upon them both the Democratic party already gives serious indications of radical division.

Justice, common sense, precedents, and the consistency of the Democratic party, and of the Government, are all on the side of the Northern section on both these questions; and when driven to an issue with the Southern section of the country will, we believe, force the Administration to fulfill its own pledges to the people of Kansas and to the country, and stand faithfully by its own Governor. If it does not, a score of Constitutions, a choice might not have been worth much; and it would be wrong to force upon a people as the fundamental instruments of Government, both of which were objectionable. The Slavery question is to be submitted by itself. By some accounts, it is the only question submitted—the voting being "For the Constitution, without the Slavery Clause." We have no doubt that, the Slavery question apart, the people would vote down upon a Constitution; but the principle involved in this method of disposing of the matter is not Democratic. An opportunity ought to be given to the people to vote for the Constitution down, no matter whether it is Pro-Slavery or Anti Slavery, if they want to.

From the Buffalo Daily Courier, (Dem.,) Nov. 17.

That the Lecompton Constitution is fatally, infallibly to express the popular will, that body has itself declared, in the act of submitting to the people their portion of its constitutional project providing for the establishment of Slavery. The only pretext upon which the Convention can claim that their decision, in respect to any of the provisions of the Constitution, is final and conclusive, rests upon a popular ratification in advance of whatever the Convention should see fit to do. Without any power thus conferred was as absolute, in respect to Slavery as to the organization of the Judiciary, or the term of office of the Governor.

Nor has any Convention any further assurance that its action in these last particulars conforms to the popular will, than in the matter of Slavery. Why, then, is only the Slavery clause submitted to the vote of the people, with no opportunity offered for rejecting the other provisions of the Constitution? If it be answered, that the public sentiment had made no question of any other provision than that of constitutional sanction than Slavery, it may be asked, What motive for withholding the other provisions from the people to pass upon their verdict is certain to be one of approval? A part of the Constitution is to be submitted for ratification; an election is to be held, all the time will be consumed, and all the excitement incurred, requisite to ascertain positively the will of the people in relation to the whole project. But this would be wrong. The will is to be conferred to only a part of it. The inference is irresistible, that any such discrimination is intended to secure the approval of those who desire to impose a Constitution upon Kansas in defiance of the popular will; and that partial submission is conceded in deference to a public sentiment that cannot safely be disregarded, and in the hope, perhaps, of mollifying the opposition that a more flagrant violation of the principle of popular sovereignty would be certain to excite. But we apprehend that the least infringement upon that principle will be as indignantly and effectually rebuked as the widest departure from it. The rights of the people are not to be trifled with. The Congress of the United States will not lend its countenance to swindling and subterfuge directed to defeat the popular will. The President of the Kansas Convention may send the Constitution to Congress, assuming the mockery of a sanction which those votes cast for Slavery will submit to be told. "The Constitution we have framed for you, you shall have; take it with Slavery or without it as you please; but in every other feature of it you must accept our dictation." But Congress will spurn the presumption and contempt of the Convention, and refuse to sanction its shameless usurpation.

From Haldeman's Parties and Union, (Dem.) Nov. 19.

"I repeat, then, as my clear conviction, that unless the Convention submit *the Constitution* to the vote of all the actual resident settlers of Kansas, and the election be fairly and justly conducted, the Constitution *will be and ought to be rejected by Congress.*"

This conviction and assurance has been frequently repeated by Gov. Walker in his intercourse with the people of the Territory. Though the Union newspaper now says that satisfied that the doctrine of popular government, and are bound to see it equitably enforced.

From the Buffalo Advertiser, (Old-Line Whig,) Nov. 17.

The latest news from Kansas is of a character to arrest attention. The Convention for forming a State Constitution adjourned on Saturday, the 7th inst., having completed its labors. No provision is made for submitting the Constitution, as a whole, to the suffrages of the people, but the Convention decided to submit at an early day relating to Slavery. The people of Kansas have as clear a right to decide on the other parts of the organic law under which they are to live, as they have to say whether they will tolerate Slavery or not within their limits. We believe that this refusal to allow the people of the Territory to vote on the Constitution as a whole will immediately be the occasion of revolt in the people of the country, and that it will be so emphatically expressed before the subject comes before Congress, that that body will not venture to set it at defiance by admitting Kansas into the State. We have of late looked carefully into the leading Democratic journals of the North-ern States, with a view to gather their sentiments on this subject, and it gives us pleasure to say, that they are unanimously and warmly enlisted in defence of the right—of the right of the people of Kansas to form their own State institutions they will live. We confidently predict, therefore, that the notion of the Kansas Convention will not be sanctioned by Congress.

From the Springfield (Ill.) Republican, Nov. 23.

THE DEMOCRACY AND KANSAS.

The Administration and the Democratic party have been successful heretofore in dodging a direct issue upon the Kansas question. But they seem to be coming to it at last, and too, when they thought the plaguey trouble was over. The late action of Mr. Calhoun's Convention creates quite a disturbance among the representatives of Democracy assembled upon Washington *Union*, the ceniral Administration organ, committed itself at once, in a grand *Yea by jee* of Democracy, to the support of the Constitution. But most of the Northern Democratic papers reject it, and show more independence and determination in their articles against it, than we have seen from them for years. It would seem to be certain that the Administration cannot carry through Congress a Constitution that has not the will of the people represented to and approved by the people of the Territory. If they attempt to do it, they will lose a new and formidable section of their supporters in the free States, and will have the just ground of opposition for the Republicans of the North and the Americans of the South. But, on the other hand, if they abandon the Constitution which has been prepared, reject it altogether, or send it back for a vote of the people, they seem to be in equal danger from the South. The Democratic party of the South is already goaded to desperation by Governor Walker's disposition to deal fairly with the Kansas matter, and are looking for some pretext for hostile eyes on the course of the President and Cabinet. They have only been kept from open revolt, heretofore, by assurances that Governor Walker did not act without the approval of the President, and that he would be rejected by a Democratic Senate, unless Mr. Buchanan chose to recall him, or interfere with his action. The Senate might, indeed, be got rid of in one of three ways; but Mr. Calhoun's Constitution is not so easily to be escaped; the Administration must express or originate the action of Congress, or take will oblige them to face a breach of their party in Congress and the country. There is certainly the most imminent prospect of the speedy realization of such a blessing to the nation that has appeared in the political horizon since the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was succeeded by Kansas.

Of course, every possible expedient will be resorted to for the avoidance of such a result. To cheat one's self is the last thing anyone has to offend the other, has been, and still is, the whole aim and purpose of Mr. Buchanan's Administration. New efforts to do this will not be wanting, but they will fail. The truth is Sooner or later, it has always been evident the Democratic party had got to account for their fugleyy with the country upon the Kansas question. They escaped it last year, but they cannot avoid it or postpone it now. The issue is made up in two cases—Governor Walker's course in the case of Kansas, Governor Johnson and McGee counties, and in Mr. Calhoun's Constitution. Both are to come up before the new Congress as the test question upon them both the Democratic party already gives serious indications of radical division.

Justice, common sense, precedents, and the consistency of the Democratic party, and of the Government, are all on the side of the Northern section on both these questions; and when driven to an issue with the Southern section of the country will, we believe, force the Administration to fulfill its own pledges to the people of Kansas and to the country, and stand faithfully by its own Governor. If it does not, a score of Constitutions, a choice might not have been worth much; and it would be wrong to force upon a people as the fundamental instruments of Government, both of which were objectionable. The Slavery question is to be submitted by itself. By some accounts, it is the only question submitted—the voting being "For the Constitution, without the Slavery Clause." We have no doubt that, the Slavery question apart, the people would vote down upon a Constitution; but the principle involved in this method of disposing of the matter is not Democratic. An opportunity ought to be given to the people to vote for the Constitution down, no matter whether it is Pro-Slavery or Anti Slavery, if they want to.

From the Buffalo Daily Courier, (Dem.,) Nov. 17.

That the Lecompton Constitution is fatally, infallibly to express the popular will, that body has itself declared, in the act of submitting to the people their portion of its constitutional project providing for the establishment of Slavery. The only pretext upon which the Convention can claim that their decision, in respect to any of the provisions of the Constitution, is final and conclusive, rests upon a popular ratification in advance of whatever the Convention should see fit to do. Without any power thus conferred was as absolute, in respect to Slavery as to the organization of the Judiciary, or the term of office of the Governor.

Nor has any Convention any further assurance that its action in these last particulars conforms to the popular will, than in the matter of Slavery. Why, then, is only the Slavery clause submitted to the vote of the people, with no opportunity offered for rejecting the other provisions of the Constitution? If it be answered, that the public sentiment had made no question of any other provision than that of constitutional sanction than Slavery, it may be asked, What motive for withholding the other provisions from the people to pass upon their verdict is certain to be one of approval? A part of the Constitution is to be submitted for ratification; an election is to be held, all the time will be consumed, and all the excitement incurred, requisite to ascertain positively the will of the people in relation to the whole project. But this would be wrong. The will is to be conferred to only a part of it. The inference is irresistible, that any such discrimination is intended to secure the approval of those who desire to impose a Constitution upon Kansas in defiance of the popular will; and that partial submission is conceded in deference to a public sentiment that cannot safely be disregarded, and in the hope, perhaps, of mollifying the opposition that a more flagrant violation of the principle of popular sovereignty would be certain to excite. But we apprehend that the least infringement upon that principle will be as indignantly and effectually rebuked as the widest departure from it. The rights of the people are not to be trifled with. The Congress of the United States will not lend its countenance to swindling and subterfuge directed to defeat the popular will. The President of the Kansas Convention may send the Constitution to Congress, assuming the mockery of a sanction which those votes cast for Slavery will submit to be told. "The Constitution we have framed for you, you shall have; take it with Slavery or without it as you please; but in every other feature of it you must accept our dictation." But Congress will spurn the presumption and contempt of the Convention, and refuse to sanction its shameless usurpation.

From Haldeman's Parties and Union, (Dem.) Nov. 19.

Their conduct, however, [Free State men,] does not excuse the Convention for refusing to submit to the entire Constitution to the people. The Democratic party is pledged to admit Kansas with such a Constitution as a majority of her citizens shall adopt; but it must be one fairly submitted and fairly adopted. The effort to force a Constitution distasteful to the people upon them, must prove futile, and cannot be recognized by that party that established the doctrine of popular government, and are bound to see it equitably enforced.

From the Buffalo Advertiser, (Old-Line Whig,) Nov. 17.

The latest news from Kansas is of a character to arrest attention. The Convention for forming a State Constitution adjourned on Saturday, the 7th inst., having completed its labors. No provision is made for submitting the Constitution, as a whole, to the suffrages of the people, but the Convention decided to submit at an early day relating to Slavery. The people of Kansas have as clear a right to decide on the other parts of the organic law under which they are to live, as they have to say whether they will tolerate Slavery or not within their limits. We believe that this refusal to allow the people of the Territory to vote on the Constitution as a whole will immediately be the occasion of revolt in the people of the country, and that it will be so emphatically expressed before the subject comes before Congress, that that body will not venture to set it at defiance by admitting Kansas into the State. We have of late looked carefully into the leading Democratic journals of the North-ern States, with a view to gather their sentiments on this subject, and it gives us pleasure to say, that they are unanimously and warmly enlisted in defence of the right—of the right of the people of Kansas to form their own State institutions they will live. We confidently predict, therefore, that the notion of the Kansas Convention will not be sanctioned by Congress.

From the Springfield (Ill.) Republican, Nov. 23.

THE DEMOCRACY AND KANSAS.

The Administration and the Democratic party have been successful heretofore in dodging a direct issue upon the Kansas question. But they seem to be coming to it at last, and too, when they thought the plaguey trouble was over. The late action of Mr. Calhoun's Convention creates quite a disturbance among the representatives of Democracy assembled upon Washington *Union*, the ceniral Administration organ, committed itself at once, in a grand *Yea by jee* of Democracy, to the support of the Constitution. But most of the Northern Democratic papers reject it, and show more independence and determination in their articles against it, than we have seen from them for years. It would seem to be certain that the Administration cannot carry through Congress a Constitution that has not the will of the people represented to and approved by the people of the Territory. If they attempt to do it, they will lose a new and formidable section of their supporters in the free States, and will have the just ground of opposition for the Republicans of the North and the Americans of the South. But, on the other hand, if they abandon the Constitution which has been prepared, reject it altogether, or send it back for a vote of the people, they seem to be in equal danger from the South. The Democratic party of the South is already goaded to desperation by Governor Walker's disposition to deal fairly with the Kansas matter, and are looking for some pretext for hostile eyes on the course of the President and Cabinet. They have only been kept from open revolt, heretofore, by assurances that Governor Walker did not act without the approval of the President, and that he would be rejected by a Democratic Senate, unless Mr. Buchanan chose to recall him, or interfere with his action. The Senate might, indeed, be got rid of in one of three ways; but Mr. Calhoun's Constitution is not so easily to be escaped; the Administration must express or originate the action of Congress, or take will oblige them to face a breach of their party in Congress and the country. There is certainly the most imminent prospect of the speedy realization of such a blessing to the nation that has appeared in the political horizon since the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was succeeded by Kansas.

Of course, every possible expedient will be resorted to for the avoidance of such a result. To cheat one's self is the last thing anyone has to offend the other, has been, and still is, the whole aim and purpose of Mr. Buchanan's Administration. New efforts to do this will not be wanting, but they will fail. The truth is Sooner or later, it has always been evident the Democratic party had got to account for their fugleyy with the country upon the Kansas question. They escaped it last year, but they cannot avoid it or postpone it now. The issue is made up in two cases—Governor Walker's course in the case of Kansas, Governor Johnson and McGee counties, and in Mr. Calhoun's Constitution. Both are to come up before the new Congress as the test question upon them both the Democratic party already gives serious indications of radical division.

Justice, common sense, precedents, and the consistency of the Democratic party, and of the Government, are all on the side of the Northern section on both these questions; and when driven to an issue with the Southern section of the country will, we believe, force the Administration to fulfill its own pledges to the people of Kansas and to the country, and stand faithfully by its own Governor. If it does not, a score of Constitutions, a choice might not have been worth much; and it would be wrong to force upon a people as the fundamental instruments of Government, both of which were objectionable. The Slavery question is to be submitted by itself. By some accounts, it is the only question submitted—the voting being "For the Constitution, without the Slavery Clause." We have no doubt that, the Slavery question apart, the people would vote down upon a Constitution; but the principle involved in this method of disposing of the matter is not Democratic. An opportunity ought to be given to the people to vote for the Constitution down, no matter whether it is Pro-Slavery or Anti Slavery, if they want to.

From the Buffalo Daily Courier, (Dem.,) Nov. 17.

That the Lecompton Constitution is fatally, infallibly to express the popular will, that body has itself declared, in the act of submitting to the people their portion of its constitutional project providing for the establishment of Slavery. The only pretext upon which the Convention can claim that their decision, in respect to any of the provisions of the Constitution, is final and conclusive, rests upon a popular ratification in advance of whatever the Convention should see fit to do. Without any power thus conferred was as absolute, in respect to Slavery as to the organization of the Judiciary, or the term of office of the Governor.

Nor has any Convention any further assurance that its action in these last particulars conforms to the popular will, than in the matter of Slavery. Why, then, is only the Slavery clause submitted to the vote of the people, with no opportunity offered for rejecting the other provisions of the Constitution? If it be answered, that the public sentiment had made no question of any other provision than that of constitutional sanction than Slavery, it may be asked, What motive for withholding the other provisions from the people to pass upon their verdict is certain to be one of approval? A part of the Constitution is to be submitted for ratification; an election is to be held, all the time will be consumed, and all the excitement incurred, requisite to ascertain positively the will of the people in relation to the whole project. But this would be wrong. The will is to be conferred to only a part of it. The inference is irresistible, that any such discrimination is intended to secure the approval of those who desire to impose a Constitution upon Kansas in defiance of the popular will; and that partial submission is conceded in deference to a public sentiment that cannot safely be disregarded, and in the hope, perhaps, of mollifying the opposition that a more flagrant violation of the principle of popular sovereignty would be certain to excite. But we apprehend that the least infringement upon that principle will be as indignantly and effectually rebuked as the widest departure from it. The rights of the people are not to be trifled with. The Congress of the United States will not lend its countenance to swindling and subterfuge directed to defeat the popular will. The President of the Kansas Convention may send the Constitution to Congress, assuming the mockery of a sanction which those votes cast for Slavery will submit to be told. "The Constitution we have framed for you, you shall have; take it with Slavery or without it as you please; but in every other feature of it you must accept our dictation." But Congress will spurn the presumption and contempt of the Convention, and refuse to sanction its shameless usurpation.

From Haldeman's Parties and Union, (Dem.) Nov. 19.

Their conduct, however, [Free State men,] does not excuse the Convention for refusing to submit to the entire Constitution to the people. The Democratic party is pledged to admit Kansas with such a Constitution as a majority of her citizens shall adopt; but it must be one

THE NATIONAL ERA: WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 10, 1857.

This conviction and assurance has been frequently repeated by Gov. Walker in his intercourse with the people of the Territory. Though the Union newspaper now says that satisfied that the doctrine of popular government, and are bound to see it equitably enforced.

From the Buffalo Advertiser, (Old-Line Whig,) Nov. 17.

The latest news from Kansas is of a character to arrest attention. The Convention for forming a State Constitution adjourned on Saturday, the 7th inst., having completed its labors. No provision is made for submitting the Constitution, as a whole, to the suffrages of the people, but the Convention decided to submit at an early day relating to Slavery. The people of Kansas have as clear a right to decide on the other parts of the organic law under which they are to live, as they have to say whether they will tolerate Slavery or not within their limits. We believe that this refusal to allow the people of the Territory to vote on the Constitution as a whole will immediately be the occasion of revolt in the people of the country, and that it will be so emphatically expressed before the subject comes before Congress, that that body will not venture to set it at defiance by admitting Kansas into the State. We have of late looked carefully into the leading Democratic journals of the North-ern States, with a view to gather their sentiments on this subject, and it gives us pleasure to say, that they are unanimously and warmly enlisted in defence of the right—of the right of the people of Kansas to form their own State institutions they will live. We confidently predict, therefore, that the notion of the Kansas Convention will not be sanctioned by Congress.

From the Springfield (Ill.) Republican, Nov. 23.

THE DEMOCRACY AND KANSAS.

The Administration and the Democratic party have been successful heretofore in dodging a direct issue upon the Kansas question. But they seem to be coming to it at last, and too, when they thought the plaguey trouble was over. The late action of Mr. Calhoun's Convention creates quite a disturbance among the representatives of Democracy assembled upon Washington *Union*, the ceniral Administration organ, committed itself at once, in a grand *Yea by jee* of Democracy, to the support of the Constitution. But most of the Northern Democratic papers reject it, and show more independence and determination in their articles against it, than we have seen from them for years. It would seem to be certain that the Administration cannot carry through Congress a Constitution that has not the will of the people represented to and approved by the people of the Territory. If they attempt to do it, they will lose a new and formidable section of their supporters in the free States, and will have the just ground of opposition for the Republicans of the North and the Americans of the South. But, on the other hand, if they abandon the Constitution which has been prepared, reject it altogether, or send it back for a vote of the people, they seem to be in equal danger from the South. The Democratic party of the South is already goaded to desperation by Governor Walker's disposition to deal fairly with the Kansas matter, and are looking for some pretext for hostile eyes on the course of the President and Cabinet. They have only been kept from open revolt, heretofore, by assurances that Governor Walker did not act without the approval of the President, and that he would be rejected by a Democratic Senate, unless Mr. Buchanan chose to recall him, or interfere with his action. The Senate might, indeed, be got rid of in one of three ways; but Mr. Calhoun's Constitution is not so easily to be escaped; the Administration must express or originate the action of Congress, or take will oblige them to face a breach of their party in Congress and the country. There is certainly the most imminent prospect of the speedy realization of such a blessing to the nation that has appeared in the political horizon since the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was succeeded by Kansas.

Of course, every possible expedient will be resorted to for the avoidance of such a result. To cheat one's self is the last thing anyone has to offend the other, has been, and still is, the whole aim and purpose of Mr. Buchanan's Administration. New efforts to do this will not be wanting, but they will fail. The truth is Sooner or later, it has always been evident the Democratic party had got to account for their fugleyy with the country upon the Kansas question. They escaped it last year, but they cannot avoid it or postpone it now. The issue is made up in two cases—Governor Walker's course in the case of Kansas, Governor Johnson and McGee counties, and in Mr. Calhoun's Constitution. Both are to come up before the new Congress as the test question upon them both the Democratic party already gives serious indications of radical division.

Justice, common sense, precedents, and the consistency of the Democratic party, and of the Government, are all on the side of the Northern section on both these questions; and when driven to an issue with the Southern section of the country will, we believe, force the Administration to fulfill its own pledges to the people of Kansas and to the country, and stand faithfully by its own Governor. If it does not, a score of Constitutions, a choice might not have been worth much; and it would be wrong to force upon a people as the fundamental instruments of Government, both of which were objectionable. The Slavery question is to be submitted by itself. By some accounts, it is the only question submitted—the voting being "For the Constitution, without the Slavery Clause." We have no doubt that, the Slavery question apart, the people would vote down upon a Constitution; but the principle involved in this method of disposing of the matter is not Democratic. An opportunity ought to be given to the people to vote for the Constitution down, no matter whether it is Pro-Slavery or Anti Slavery, if they want to.

From the Buffalo Daily Courier, (Dem.,) Nov. 17.

That the Lecompton Constitution is fatally, infallibly to express the popular will, that body has itself declared, in the act of submitting to the people their portion of its constitutional project providing for the establishment of Slavery. The only pretext upon which the Convention can claim that their decision, in respect to any of the provisions of the Constitution, is final and conclusive, rests upon a popular ratification in advance of whatever the Convention should see fit to do. Without any power thus conferred was as absolute, in respect to Slavery as to the organization of the Judiciary, or the term of office of the Governor.

Nor has any Convention any further assurance that its action in these last particulars conforms to the popular will, than in the matter of Slavery. Why, then, is only the Slavery clause submitted to the vote of the people, with no opportunity offered for rejecting the other provisions of the Constitution? If it be answered, that the public sentiment had made no question of any other provision than that of constitutional sanction than Slavery, it may be asked, What motive for withholding the other provisions from the people to pass upon their verdict is certain to be one of approval? A part of the Constitution is to be submitted for ratification; an election is to be held, all the time will be consumed, and all the excitement incurred, requisite to ascertain positively the will of the people in relation to the whole project. But this would be wrong. The will is to be conferred to only a part of it. The inference is irresistible, that any such discrimination is intended to secure the approval of those who desire to impose a Constitution upon Kansas in defiance of the popular will; and that partial submission is conceded in deference to a public sentiment that cannot safely be disregarded, and in the hope, perhaps, of mollifying the opposition that a more flagrant violation of the principle of popular sovereignty would be certain to excite. But we apprehend that the least infringement upon that principle will be as indignantly and effectually rebuked as the widest departure from it. The rights of the people are not to be trifled with. The Congress of the United States will not lend its countenance to swindling and subterfuge directed to defeat the popular will. The President of the Kansas Convention may send the Constitution to Congress, assuming the mockery of a sanction which those votes cast for Slavery will submit to be told. "The Constitution we have framed for you, you shall have; take it with Slavery or without it as you please; but in every other feature of it you must accept our dictation." But Congress will spurn the presumption and contempt of the Convention, and refuse to sanction its shameless usurpation.

From Haldeman's Parties and Union, (Dem.) Nov. 19.

Their conduct, however, [Free State men,] does not excuse the Convention for refusing to submit to the entire Constitution to the people. The Democratic party is pledged to admit Kansas with such a Constitution as a majority of her citizens shall adopt; but it must be one

THE NORTH AND THE SOUTH.

A STATISTICAL VIEW

OF THE CONDITION OF

THE FREE AND SLAVE STATES.

By Henry Chase and Charles W. Sanborn.

Compiled from Official Documents.

12mo. *Bound in cloth. Price 50 cents. Post-age 12 cents.*

If any one wishes to know what Slavery has done for the South, and Freedom for the North, let them read this statistical work. The work makes figures. Here a copy of these statistics in the hands of every voter, and any voter will find that Slavery has done for the South what North is 1850, as clean as it has swept New England in 1776. Slavery has done for the South what it has done dispassionately at this array of figures, and see what they say.

The able editor of the *Evening Transcript*, Boston, thus speaks of this work:

"The Boston Board of Trade recently adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That among the means of avoiding a recurrence of our present difficulties, we regard the establishment of additional restrictions upon the bank issues, *the abolition of small bills*, the limitation of their loans and circulation, as an important and the specie reserve."

We shall look with interest for the message of Governor Banks; and we trust he may show to the people of Massachusetts and to the country that there is no need of forcing back into the party in profiting by the fearful lessons taught by the monetary convulsion through which the country is passing, and which is traceable to the facility of creating paper money by bank directors and their companies, at the cost of the working classes. O. P. Q.

BURNING OF THE STEAMER RAINBOW.

On the morning of the 21st, about 2 o'clock, the steamer Rainbow, Capt. Holcraft, on her way from New Orleans to Louisville, with a full cargo of sugar and coffee, and with about 150 passengers on board, was burned to the water-line about three miles above Napoleon, and near the head of Island 74, was discovered to be on fire, and run in shore. Mr. Wm. Wallace, at once gave the order to run her on shore—which order was immediately executed by Mr. Lamb, the pilot at the wheel; but by that time the entire lower portion of the steamer was out of the passengers and crew that were on the forward part of the boat escaped without difficulty. Those that were aft were cut off from any means of escape, except by jumping into the water—and although it was only a few yards to the shore, but few escaped that got into the water, and those that did, when they left their berths—some were overcome with fright, and knew not which way to move, and thus were lost.

The books and papers being lost, it is a matter of utter impossibility to ascertain the names of the lost or saved; but, after carefully comparing the list of passengers with the survivors, we cannot make the loss less than seventy-five human beings, all ushered into the presence of their Maker without a moment's warning.

The officers of the boat agree that the fire originated in the cook house, which being cleared, they think that the fire was under full way before being discovered, as they say they started that nothing could be done to arrest its progress.

The cargo consisted of sugar, molasses, and coffee, for Lonisville—about 300 tons in all—a total loss.

The passengers, or a majority of them, were returned Californians, with their treasures of gold and their families, coming back to their *fatherland*, but, alas, to meet with the cold embrace of death, and the horrid picture presented of that o' kindred and friends from whom they had been so long separated.

All the passengers lost everything—money, clothes, &c., &c., except that which they had on. Forty or fifty thousand dollars in gold and twenty thousand in jewelry was unfortunately lost.

The boat's safe with contents was soon recovered, and those of the passengers who had deposited their money in the office were saved from loss in that quarter.

Mr. Wheatley, from California, with wife and child, jumped from the stern, and struck boldly out for the shore, and by good luck and strength might have been